# Framework – CNDI 2014

## Strategy

#### The 2014-2015 high school debate topic is:

#### “Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its non-military exploration and/or development of the earth’s oceans.”

## 1NC

#### A – Interpretation:

#### Topical affirmatives must affirm the resolution through instrumental defense of action by the United States Federal Government.

#### B – Definitions

#### Should denotes an expectation of enacting a plan

#### **American Heritage Dictionary 2000 (Dictionary.com)**

should. The will to do something or have something take place: I shall go out if I feel like it.

#### Federal government is the central government in Washington DC

Encarta Online 2005,

http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia\_1741500781\_6/United\_States\_(Government).html#howtocite

United States (Government), the combination of federal, state, and local laws, bodies, and agencies that is responsible for carrying out the operations of the United States. The federal government of the United States is centered in [Washington, D.C.](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761576320/Washington_D_C.html)

#### Resolved implies a policy

Louisiana House 3-8-2005, <http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm>

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

#### C – Vote neg –

#### First is Decisionmaking

#### The primary purpose of debate should be to improve our skills as decision-makers. We are all individual policy-makers who make choices every day that affect us and those around us. We have an obligation to the people affected by our decisions to use debate as a method for honing these critical thinking and information processing abilities.

Austin J. Freeley and David L. Steinberg – John Carroll University / U Miami – 2009, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, p. 1-4, googlebooks

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition.¶ Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions.¶ Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making bodies from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations.¶ We all make many decisions every day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car. what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate to vote for, paper or plastic, all present us with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration?¶ Is the defendant guilty as accused? The Daily Show or the ball game? And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIME magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs. online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople, academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs?¶ The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates.¶ Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized.¶ Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others.¶ Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.

#### Additionally, The best route to improving decision-making is through discussion about public policy

#### Mutually accessible information – There is a wide swath of literature on governmental policy topics – that ensures there will be informed, predictable, and in-depth debate over the aff’s decision. Individual policymaking is highly variable depending on the person and inaccessible to outsiders.

#### Harder decisions make better decisionmakers – The problems facing public policymakers are a magnitude greater than private decisions. We all know plans don’t actually happen, but practicing imagining the consequences of our decisions in the high-stakes games of public policymaking makes other decisionmaking easier.

#### External actors – the decisions we make should be analyzed not in a vacuum but in the complex social field that surrounds us

#### Second is Predictable Limits - The resolution proposes the question the negative is prepared to answer and creates a bounded list of potential affs for us to think about. Debate has unique potential to change attitudes and grow critical thinking skills because it forces pre-round internal deliberation on a of a focused, common ground of debate

Robert E. Goodin and Simon J. Niemeyer- Australian National University- 2003,

When Does Deliberation Begin? Internal Reflection versus Public Discussion in Deliberative Democracy, POLITICAL STUDIES: 2003 VOL 51, 627–649, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0032-3217.2003.00450.x/pdf

What happened in this particular case, as in any particular case, was in some respects peculiar unto itself. The problem of the Bloomfield Track had been well known and much discussed in the local community for a long time. Exaggerated claims and counter-claims had become entrenched, and unreflective public opinion polarized around them. In this circumstance, the effect of the information phase of deliberative processes was to brush away those highly polarized attitudes, dispel the myths and symbolic posturing on both sides that had come to dominate the debate, and liberate people to act upon their attitudes toward the protection of rainforest itself. The key point, from the perspective of ‘democratic deliberation within’, is that that happened in the earlier stages of deliberation – before the formal discussions (‘deliberations’, in the discursive sense) of the jury process ever began. The simple process of jurors seeing the site for themselves, focusing their minds on the issues and listening to what experts had to say did virtually all the work in changing jurors’ attitudes. Talking among themselves, as a jury, did very little of it. However, the same might happen in cases very different from this one. Suppose that instead of highly polarized symbolic attitudes, what we have at the outset is mass ignorance or mass apathy or non-attitudes. There again, people’s engaging with the issue – focusing on it, acquiring information about it, thinking hard about it – would be something that is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the deliberative process. And more to our point, it is something that is most likely to occur within individuals themselves or in informal interactions, well in advance of any formal, organized group discussion. There is much in the large literature on attitudes and the mechanisms by which they change to support that speculation.31 Consider, for example, the literature on ‘central’ versus ‘peripheral’ routes to the formation of attitudes. Before deliberation, individuals may not have given the issue much thought or bothered to engage in an extensive process of reflection.32 In such cases, positions may be arrived at via peripheral routes, taking cognitive shortcuts or arriving at ‘top of the head’ conclusions or even simply following the lead of others believed to hold similar attitudes or values (Lupia, 1994). These shorthand approaches involve the use of available cues such as ‘expertness’ or ‘attractiveness’ (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986) – not deliberation in the internal-reflective sense we have described. Where peripheral shortcuts are employed, there may be inconsistencies in logic and the formation of positions, based on partial information or incomplete information processing. In contrast, ‘central’ routes to the development of attitudes involve the application of more deliberate effort to the matter at hand, in a way that is more akin to the internal-reflective deliberative ideal. Importantly for our thesis, there is nothing intrinsic to the ‘central’ route that requires group deliberation. Research in this area stresses instead the importance simply of ‘sufficient impetus’ for engaging in deliberation, such as when an individual is stimulated by personal involvement in the issue.33 The same is true of ‘on-line’ versus ‘memory-based’ processes of attitude change.34 The suggestion here is that we lead our ordinary lives largely on autopilot, doing routine things in routine ways without much thought or reflection. When we come across something ‘new’, we update our routines – our ‘running’ beliefs and pro cedures, attitudes and evaluations – accordingly. But having updated, we then drop the impetus for the update into deep-stored ‘memory’. A consequence of this procedure is that, when asked in the ordinary course of events ‘what we believe’ or ‘what attitude we take’ toward something, we easily retrieve what we think but we cannot so easily retrieve the reasons why. That more fully reasoned assessment – the sort of thing we have been calling internal-reflective deliberation – requires us to call up reasons from stored memory rather than just consulting our running on-line ‘summary judgments’. Crucially for our present discussion, once again, what prompts that shift from online to more deeply reflective deliberation is not necessarily interpersonal discussion. The impetus for fixing one’s attention on a topic, and retrieving reasons from stored memory, might come from any of a number sources: group discussion is only one. And again, even in the context of a group discussion, this shift from ‘online’ to ‘memory-based’ processing is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the process, often before the formal discussion ever begins. All this is simply to say that, on a great many models and in a great many different sorts of settings, it seems likely that elements of the pre-discursive process are likely to prove crucial to the shaping and reshaping of people’s attitudes in a citizens’ jury-style process. The initial processes of focusing attention on a topic, providing information about it and inviting people to think hard about it is likely to provide a strong impetus to internal-reflective deliberation, altering not just the information people have about the issue but also the way people process that information and hence (perhaps) what they think about the issue. What happens once people have shifted into this more internal-reflective mode is, obviously, an open question. Maybe people would then come to an easy consensus, as they did in their attitudes toward the Daintree rainforest.35 Or maybe people would come to divergent conclusions; and they then may (or may not) be open to argument and counter-argument, with talk actually changing minds. Our claim is not that group discussion will always matter as little as it did in our citizens’ jury.36 Our claim is instead merely that the earliest steps in the jury process – the sheer focusing of attention on the issue at hand and acquiring more information about it, and the internal-reflective deliberation that that prompts – will invariably matter more than deliberative democrats of a more discursive stripe would have us believe. However much or little difference formal group discussions might make, on any given occasion, the pre-discursive phases of the jury process will invariably have a considerable impact on changing the way jurors approach an issue. From Citizens’ Juries to Ordinary Mass Politics? In a citizens’ jury sort of setting, then, it seems that informal, pre-group deliberation – ‘deliberation within’ – will inevitably do much of the work that deliberative democrats ordinarily want to attribute to the more formal discursive processes. What are the preconditions for that happening? To what extent, in that sense, can findings about citizens’ juries be extended to other larger or less well-ordered deliberative settings? Even in citizens’ juries, deliberation will work only if people are attentive, open and willing to change their minds as appropriate. So, too, in mass politics. In citizens’ juries the need to participate (or **the anticipation of participating) in formally organized group discussions might be the ‘prompt’ that evokes those attributes**. But there might be many other possible ‘prompts’ that can be found in less formally structured mass-political settings. Here are a few ways citizens’ juries (and all cognate micro-deliberative processes)37 might be different from mass politics, and in which lessons drawn from that experience might not therefore carry over to ordinary politics: • A citizens’ jury concentrates people’s minds on a single issue. Ordinary politics involve many issues at once. • A citizens’ jury is often supplied a background briefing that has been agreed by all stakeholders (Smith and Wales, 2000, p. 58). In ordinary mass politics, there is rarely any equivalent common ground on which debates are conducted. • A citizens’ jury separates the process of acquiring information from that of discussing the issues. In ordinary mass politics, those processes are invariably intertwined. • A citizens’ jury is provided with a set of experts. They can be questioned, debated or discounted. But there is a strictly limited set of ‘competing experts’ on the same subject. In ordinary mass politics, claims and sources of expertise often seem virtually limitless, allowing for much greater ‘selective perception’. • Participating in something called a ‘citizens’ jury’ evokes certain very particular norms: norms concerning the ‘impartiality’ appropriate to jurors; norms concerning the ‘common good’ orientation appropriate to people in their capacity as citizens.38 There is a very different ethos at work in ordinary mass politics, which are typically driven by flagrantly partisan appeals to sectional interest (or utter disinterest and voter apathy). • In a citizens’ jury, **we think and listen in anticipation of the discussion phase, knowing that we soon will have to defend our views in a discursive setting where they will be probed intensively**.39 In ordinary mass-political settings, there is no such incentive for paying attention. It is perfectly true that citizens’ juries are ‘special’ in all those ways. But if being special in all those ways makes for a better – more ‘reflective’, more ‘deliberative’ – political process, then those are design features that we ought try to mimic as best we can in ordinary mass politics as well. There are various ways that that might be done. Briefing books might be prepared by sponsors of American presidential debates (the League of Women Voters, and such like) in consultation with the stakeholders involved. Agreed panels of experts might be questioned on prime-time television. Issues might be sequenced for debate and resolution, to avoid too much competition for people’s time and attention. Variations on the Ackerman and Fishkin (2002) proposal for a ‘deliberation day’ before every election might be generalized, with a day every few months being given over to small meetings in local schools to discuss public issues. All that is pretty visionary, perhaps. And (although it is clearly beyond the scope of the present paper to explore them in depth) there are doubtless many other more-or-less visionary ways of introducing into real-world politics analogues of the elements that induce citizens’ jurors to practice ‘democratic deliberation within’, even before the jury discussion gets underway. Here, we have to content ourselves with identifying those features that need to be replicated in real-world politics in order to achieve that goal – and with the ‘possibility theorem’ that is established by the fact that (as sketched immediately above) there is at least one possible way of doing that for each of those key features.

#### Third is Dogmatism – Most problems are not black and white but have complex, uncertain interactions. By declaring that \_\_\_\_\_ is always bad, they prevent us from understanding the nuances of an incredibly important and complex issue. This is the epitome of dogmatism

Keller, et. al,– Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago - 2001

(Thomas E., James K., and Tracly K., Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago, professor of Social Work, and doctoral student School of Social Work, “Student debates in policy courses: promoting policy practice skills and knowledge through active learning,” Journal of Social Work Education, Spr/Summer 2001, EBSCOhost)

John Dewey, the philosopher and educational reformer, suggested that the initial advance in the development of reflective thought occurs in the transition from holding fixed, static ideas to an attitude of doubt and questioning engendered by exposure to alternative views in social discourse (Baker, 1955, pp. 36-40). Doubt, confusion, and conflict resulting from discussion of diverse perspectives "force comparison, selection, and reformulation of ideas and meanings" (Baker, 1955, p. 45). Subsequent educational theorists have contended that learning requires openness to divergent ideas in combination with the ability to synthesize disparate views into a purposeful resolution (Kolb, 1984; Perry, 1970). On the one hand, clinging to the certainty of one's beliefs risks dogmatism, rigidity, and the inability to learn from new experiences. On the other hand, if one's opinion is altered by every new experience, the result is insecurity, paralysis, and the inability to take effective action. The educator's role is to help students develop the capacity to incorporate new and sometimes conflicting ideas and experiences into a coherent cognitive framework. Kolb suggests that, "if the education process begins by bringing out the learner's beliefs and theories, examining and testing them, and then integrating the new, more refined ideas in the person's belief systems, the learning process will be facilitated" (p. 28).

The authors believe that involving students in substantive debates challenges them to learn and grow in the fashion described by Dewey and Kolb. Participation in a debate stimulates clarification and critical evaluation of the evidence, logic, and values underlying one's own policy position. In addition, to debate effectively students must understand and accurately evaluate the opposing perspective. The ensuing tension between two distinct but legitimate views is designed to yield a reevaluation and reconstruction of knowledge and beliefs pertaining to the issue.

#### Our method solves – Even if the resolution is wrong, having a devil’s advocate in deliberation is vitally important to critical thinking skills and avoiding groupthink

Hugo Mercier and Hélène Landemore- 2011

(Philosophy, Politics and Economics prof @ U of Penn, Poli Sci prof @ Yale), Reasoning is for arguing: Understanding the successes and failures of deliberation, Political Psychology, http://sites.google.com/site/hugomercier/publications

Reasoning can function outside of its normal conditions when it is used purely internally. But it is not enough for reasoning to be done in public to achieve good results. And indeed the problems of individual reasoning highlighted above, such as polarization and overconfidence, can also be found in group reasoning (Janis, 1982; Stasser & Titus, 1985; Sunstein, 2002). Polarization and overconfidence happen because not all group discussion is deliberative. According to some definitions of deliberation, including the one used in this paper, reasoning has to be applied to the same thread of argument *from different opinions* for deliberation to occur. As a consequence, “If the participants are mostly like-minded or hold the same views before they enter into the discussion, they are not situated in the circumstances of deliberation.” (Thompson, 2008: 502). We will presently review evidence showing that the absence or the silencing of dissent is a quasi-necessary condition for polarization or overconfidence to occur in groups. Group polarization has received substantial empirical support. 11 So much support in fact that Sunstein has granted group polarization the status of law (Sunstein, 2002). There is however an important caveat: group polarization will mostly happen when people share an opinion to begin with. In defense of his claim, Sunstein reviews an impressive number of empirical studies showing that many groups tend to form more extreme opinions following discussion. The examples he uses, however, offer as convincing an illustration of group polarization than of the necessity of having group members that share similar beliefs at the outset for polarization to happen (e.g. Sunstein, 2002: 178). Likewise, in his review of the group polarization literature, Baron notes that “The crucial antecedent condition for group polarization to occur is the presence of a likeminded group; i.e. individuals who share a preference for one side of the issue.” (Baron, 2005). Accordingly, when groups do not share an opinion, they tend to depolarize. This has been shown in several experiments in the laboratory (e.g. Kogan & Wallach, 1966; Vinokur & Burnstein, 1978). Likewise, studies of deliberation about political or legal issues report that many groups do not polarize (Kaplan & Miller, 1987; Luskin, Fishkin, & Hahn, 2007; Luskin et al., 2002; Luskin, Iyengar, & Fishkin, 2004; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2000). On the contrary, some groups show a homogenization of their attitude (they depolarize) (Luskin et al., 2007; Luskin et al., 2002). The contrasting effect of discussions with a supportive versus dissenting audience is transparent in the results reported by Hansen ( 2003 reported by Fishkin & Luskin, 2005). Participants had been exposed to new information about a political issue. When they discussed it with their family and friends, they learned more facts supporting their initial position. On the other hand, during the deliberative weekend—and the exposition to other opinions that took place—they learned more of the facts supporting the view they disagreed with. The present theory, far from being contradicted by the observation that groups of likeminded people reasoning together tend to polarize, can in fact account straightforwardly for this observation. When people are engaged in a genuine deliberation, the confirmation bias present in each individual’s reasoning is checked, compensated by the confirmation bias of individuals who defend another opinion. When no other opinion is present (or expressed, or listened to), people will be disinclined to use reasoning to critically examine the arguments put forward by other discussants, since they share their opinion. Instead, they will use reasoning to strengthen these arguments or find other arguments supporting the same opinion. In most cases the reasons each individual has for holding the same opinion will be partially non-overlapping. Each participant will then be exposed to new reasons supporting the common opinion, reasons that she is unlikely to criticize. It is then only to be expected that group members should strengthen their support for the common opinion in light of these new arguments. In fact, groups of like-minded people should have little endogenous motivation to start reasoning together: what is the point of arguing with people we agree with? In most cases, such groups are lead to argue because of some external constraint. These constraints can be more or less artificial—a psychologist telling participants to deliberate or a judge asking a jury for a well supported verdict—but they have to be factored in the explanation of the phenomenon. 4. Conclusion: a situational approach to improving reasoning We have argued that reasoning should not be evaluated primarily, if at all, as a device that helps us generate knowledge and make better decisions through private reflection. Reasoning, in fact, does not do those things very well. Instead, we rely on the hypothesis that the function of reasoning is to find and evaluate arguments in deliberative contexts. This evolutionary hypothesis explains why, when reasoning is used in its normal conditions—in a deliberation—it can be expected to lead to better outcomes, consistently allowing deliberating groups to reach epistemically superior outcomes and improve their epistemic status. Moreover, seeing reasoning as an argumentative device also provides a straightforward account of the otherwise puzzling confirmation bias—the tendency to search for arguments that favor our opinion. The confirmation bias, in turn, generates most of the problems people face when they reason in abnormal conditions— when they are not deliberating. This will happen to people who reason alone while failing to entertain other opinions in a private deliberation and to groups in which one opinion is so dominant as to make all others opinions—if they are even present—unable to voice arguments. In both cases, the confirmation bias will go unchecked and create polarization and overconfidence. We believe that the argumentative theory offers a good explanation of the most salient facts about private and public reasoning. This explanation is meant to supplement, rather than replace, existing psychological theories by providing both an answer to the why-questions and a coherent integrative framework for many previously disparate findings. The present article was mostly aimed at comparing deliberative vs. non-deliberative situations, but the theory could also be used to make finer grained predictions within deliberative situations. It is important to stress that the theory used as the backbone for the article is a theory of reasoning. The theory can only make predictions about reasoning, and not about the various other psychological mechanisms that impact the outcome of group discussion. We did not aim at providing a general theory of group processes that could account for all the results in this domain. But it is our contention that the best way to reach this end is by investigating the relevant psychological mechanisms and their interaction. For these reasons, the present article should only be considered a first step towards more fined grained predictions of when and why deliberation is efficient. Turning now to the consequences of the present theory, we can note first that our emphasis on the efficiency of diverse groups sits well with another recent a priori account of group competence. According to Hong and Page’s Diversity Trumps Ability Theorem for example, under certain plausible conditions, a diverse sample of moderately competent individuals will outperform a group of the most competent individuals (Hong & Page, 2004). Specifically, what explains the superiority of some groups of average people over smaller groups of experts is the fact that cognitive diversity (roughly, the ability to interpret the world differently) can be more crucial to group competence than individual ability (Page, 2007). That argument has been carried over from groups of problem-solvers in business and practical matters to democratically deliberating groups in politics (e.g., Anderson, 2006; Author, 2007, In press). At the practical level, the present theory potentially has important implications. Given that individual reasoning works best when confronted to different opinions, the present theory supports the improvement of the presence or expression of dissenting opinions in deliberative settings. Evidently, many people, in the field of deliberative democracy or elsewhere, are also advocating such changes. While these common sense suggestions have been made in the past (e.g., Bohman,

2007; Sunstein, 2003, 2006), the present theory provides additional arguments for them. It also explains why approaches focusing on individual rather than collective reasoning are not likely to be successful. Specifically tailored practical suggestions can also be made by using departures from the normal conditions of reasoning as diagnostic tools. Thus, different departures will entail different solutions. Accountability—having to defends one’s opinion in front of an audience—can be used to bring individual reasoners closer to a situation of private deliberation. The use of different aggregation mechanisms could help identify the risk of deliberation among like-minded people. For example, before a group launches a discussion, a preliminary vote or poll could establish the extent to which different opinions are represented. If this procedure shows that people agree on the issue at hand, then skipping the discussion may save the group some efforts and reduce the risk of polarization. Alternatively, a **devil’s advocate** could be introduced in the group to defend an alternative opinion (e.g. Schweiger, Sandberg, & Ragan, 1986).

## 2NC Overviews

### 2NC T – USFG

#### Our interpretation is that you must tie your advocacy to United States federal government action. None of the 2AC offense applies – their arguments are indicts of things like utilitarianism and governmental roleplaying.

#### We solve all their offense – you can sing a song, read a poem, argue that representations are important, and read evidence from the Onion – but the thesis of your argument requires a component that demands change in federal government policy. Treat this like a “topical version of your aff” argument – you could [ whatever the 1AC does ] as long as you talk about a way the government can remedy those harms.

#### And if they’re right that it’s good to change debate and disrupt the community, you should just vote for us if they win – nothing would disrupt debate more than voting for the losing team.

### 2NC Topic-Oriented Policy Debate Good

#### The resolution asks a question: Should the United States federal government increase its exploration or development of the ocean? Nothing they have said in the 1AC is responsive to the resolutional question. They presuppose we are in a forum designed for activism and have not presented a warrant for this assertion. If the topic was about what we can do in our own spheres of influence, we would have had a different answer in the 1NC.

#### None of your offense applies – your advantages are still accessible if you discuss the topic – you just need to find a link argument between economic engagement and [whatever the aff says]. This is best because even if not fully prepared, we can still negate your endorsement of the topic.

#### And if they’re right that it’s good to change debate and disrupt the community, you should just vote for us if they win – nothing would disrupt debate more than voting for the losing team.

### Violation – 2nd Line

#### You don’t meet – you [didn’t read a plan] or [don’t defend the hypothetical implementation of the plan text by the United States federal government]

#### ( ) Any aff would be topical – using the topic as a “starting point” for other discussions creates an infinite list of potential affs (queer theory, gender, security, language, etc.). You can read these things as advantages – but you’ve gotta have a plan that aims to “solve” them.

#### ( ) A stable advocacy is key – without a plan, they can re-explain their relationship to transportation after the 1NC to avoid anything we criticize. The aff must unambiguously say something is good for the neg to have the ability to say it’s bad.

## Impact 2NCs

### Process 1st

#### ( ) It’s not about what we learn, but how we learn it. We’ll forget most of the individual pieces of knowledge in this debate, but we’ll remember the skills we employed to answer them. Proves that your argument is – with all due respect – wholly irrelevant

Avari et al ‘4

[J. Prof Natural Resources at OSU. “Teaching Students to Make Better Decisions about the Environment: Lessons from Decision Sciences” Journal of Environmental Education, Vol 36 N 1. 2004 Ebsco]

How do we achieve this goal of facilitating more thoughtful decisions? One strategy involves improving students’ technical knowledge base (e.g., in biology, ecology, chemistry) as a means of creating favorable attitudes toward the promotion of better environmental quality (Ramsey & Rickson, 1976). As many researchers have pointed out, however, focusing on enhancing technical knowledge without also teaching problem-solving skills will lead to substantial shortcomings with respect to promoting thoughtful decisions (e.g., see Hungerford, Peyton, & Wilke, 1980). An obvious solution, therefore, is to include in curricula elements that address the need for knowledge about both natural systems and “action” (i.e., decision-making) skills (Simmons, 1991). Yet, as Hungerford and Volk (1990) point out, focusing on the role of human judgments and behavior (in addition to enhancing technical knowledge) in the context of the environment makes instructional planning extremely difficult. In many cases, the added difficulty acts as a deterrent to these integrated curricula and provides de facto reinforcement for the model that enhanced knowledge leads to better decisions. One suggested strategy for overcoming this difficulty is to teach students the skills to critically analyze environmental issues (e.g., how to articulate research questions, obtain information from primary and secondary sources, and interpret data). At the end of such an exercise, students work on the development of “issue-resolution action plans” and then “decide whether they want to actually implement the plan of action” (Hungerford & Volk, 1990, p. 16). We view such an approach as laudable. We would take this suggestion a step further, however, and add that just as students must learn skills for critical analysis, so too must they learn skills for decision making (which includes developing alternative courses of action and making decisions about implementation). Learning these decision-making skills involves two steps: First, students (and in many cases, teachers) must be taught to recognize common obstacles to thoughtful (or high-quality) decision making. Second, they must acquire skills to overcome them. These obstacles and skills are the focus of this article.

### Dialogue – Impact 2NC

#### Our interpretation’s key to meaningful, informed and productive Dialogue – Hanghoj says the pre-designed nature of the debate game space is necessary to protect the balance between forums that are too narrow to be productive and too broad to be predictable. The alternative is monological discourse, which guts the educational potential of debate as a *forum for change* because we never *learn* from one another.

#### Dialogue 1st – it’s the pre-eminent impact. Morson says that the process of learning is more important than learning itself and turns their education claims because we cannot effectively educate one another unless we *first* learn to learn.

#### ( ) Dialogue is critical to affirming any value—shutting down deliberation devolves into totalitarianism and reinscribes oppression

Morson ‘4

[Northwestern Professor, Prof. Morson's work ranges over a variety of areas: literary theory (especially narrative); the history of ideas, both Russian and European; a variety of literary genres (especially satire, utopia, and the novel); and his favorite writers -- Chekhov, Gogol, and, above all, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. He is especially interested in the relation of literature to philosophy. <http://www.flt.uae.ac.ma/elhirech/baktine/0521831059.pdf#page=331>]

Bakhtin viewed the whole process of “ideological” (in the sense of ideas and values, however unsystematic) development as an endless dialogue. As teachers, we find it difficult to avoid a voice of authority, however much we may think of ours as the rebel’s voice, because our rebelliousness against society at large speaks in the authoritative voice of our subculture.We speak the language and thoughts of academic educators, even when we imagine we are speaking in no jargon at all, and that jargon, inaudible to us, sounds with all the overtones of authority to our students. We are so prone to think of ourselves as fighting oppression that it takes some work to realize that we ourselves may be felt as oppressive and overbearing, and that our own voice may provoke the same reactions that we feel when we hear an authoritative voice with which we disagree. So it is often helpful to think back on the great authoritative oppressors and reconstruct their self-image: helpful, but often painful. I remember, many years ago, when, as a recent student rebel and activist, I taught a course on “The Theme of the Rebel” and discovered, to my considerable chagrin, that many of the great rebels of history were the very same people as the great oppressors. There is a famous exchange between Erasmus and Luther, who hoped to bring the great Dutch humanist over to the Reformation, but Erasmus kept asking Luther how he could be so certain of so many doctrinal points. We must accept a few things to be Christians at all, Erasmus wrote, but surely beyond that there must be room for us highly fallible beings to disagree. Luther would have none of such tentativeness. He knew, he was sure. The Protestant rebels were, for a while, far more intolerant than their orthodox opponents. Often enough, the oppressors are the ones who present themselves and really think of themselves as liberators. Certainty that one knows the root cause of evil: isn’t that itself often the root cause? We know from Tsar Ivan the Terrible’s letters denouncing Prince Kurbsky, a general who escaped to Poland, that Ivan saw himself as someone who had been oppressed by noblemen as a child and pictured himself as the great rebel against traditional authority when he killed masses of people or destroyed whole towns. There is something in the nature of maximal rebellion against authority that produces ever greater intolerance, unless one is very careful. For the skills of fighting or refuting an oppressive power are not those of openness, self-skepticism, or real dialogue. In preparing for my course, I remember my dismay at reading Hitler’s Mein Kampf and discovering that his self-consciousness was precisely that of the rebel speaking in the name of oppressed Germans, and that much of his amazing appeal – otherwise so inexplicable – was to the German sense that they were rebelling victims. In our time, the Serbian Communist and nationalist leader Slobodan Milosevic exploited much the same appeal. Bakhtin surely knew that Communist totalitarianism, the Gulag, and the unprecedented censorship were constructed by rebels who had come to power. His favorite writer, Dostoevsky, used to emphasize that the worst oppression comes from those who, with the rebellious psychology of “the insulted and humiliated,” have seized power – unless they have somehow cultivated the value of dialogue, as Lenin surely had not, but which Eva, in the essay by Knoeller about teaching The Autobiography of Malcolm X, surely had. Rebels often make the worst tyrants because their word, the voice they hear in their consciousness, has borrowed something crucial from the authoritative word it opposed, and perhaps exaggerated it: the aura of righteous authority. If one’s ideological becoming is understood as a struggle in which one has at last achieved the truth, one is likely to want to impose that truth with maximal authority; and rebels of the next generation may proceed in much the same way, in an ongoing spiral of intolerance.

#### ( ) This is also an extinction DA to their model of debate – they produce advocates who are unable to *effectively deliberate* on behalf of their cause – that results in every catastrophic scenario imaginable

Lundberg ‘10

[Chris. Prof Communications at UNC-Chapel Hill. “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century, Ed. Louden. Pg 311]

The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. But the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech—as indicated earlier, debate builds capacity for critical thinking, analysis of public claims, informed decision making, and better public judgment. If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid scientific and technological change outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a puzzling solution, at best, to argue that these conditions warrant giving up on debate. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems place such a high premium on education (Dewey 1988,63, 154). Debate provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed about policy decisions that impact them, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them.¶ The merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources:¶ To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144)¶ Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim that debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of problem-solving skills demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials.¶ There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively, the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice in the classroom as a technology for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities. The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of meaningful political engagement and new articulations of democratic life.¶ Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to produce revisions of democratic life that are necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive. Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including: domestic and international issues of class, gender, and racial justice; wholesale environmental destruction and the potential for rapid climate change; emerging threats to international stability in the form of terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; and increasing challenges of rapid globalization including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, an informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill and sensitivity provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with the existential challenges to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.

### DecisionMaking – Impact 2NC

#### Decision-making is the primary purpose of debate – we are individual policymakers who make every-day choices that affect our surrounding environments. We have an obligation to the people affected by our decisions to use debate as a forum to improve our critical thinking skills. Steinberg and Freely say this is best method for achieving this is discussion of public policy – it ensures we debate over a mutually accessible literature base. There is tons of information available to debate the merits of government policy, which ensures there will be informed and in-depth debate over the content of the aff. Their model of debate only discusses individual actions – which is *highly variable* and *inaccessible* to outsiders.

#### Their model of decisionmaking is also easier than ours – finding public policy solutions is several degrees of magnitude more difficult than individual solutions – roleplaying as the government and imagining the consequences of policy decisions improves the skills for all other forms of advocacy.

#### ( ) Decisionmaking accesses every impact

Steinberg and Freely ‘8

[Austin – Civil Rights Attorney and David – Lecturer in Communication at Miami. Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, 2008, Pg 9-10]

If we assume it to be possible without recourse to violence to reach agreement on all the problems implied in the employment of the idea of justice we are granting the possibility of formulating an ideal of man and society, valid for all beings endowed with reason and accepted by what we have called elsewhere the universal audience.14¶ I think that the only discursive methods available to us stem from techniques that are not demonstrative—that is, conclusive and rational in the narrow sense of the term—but from argumentative techniques which are not conclusive but which may tend to demonstrate the reasonable character of the conceptions put forward. It is this recourse to the rational and reasonable for the realization of the ideal of universal communion that characterizes the age-long endeavor of all philosophies in their aspiration for a city of man in which violence may progressively give way to wisdom.13¶ Whenever an individual controls the dimensions of" a problem, he or she can solve the problem through a personal decision. For example, if the problem is whether to go to the basketball game tonight, if tickets are not too expensive and if transportation is available, the decision can be made individually. But if a friend's car is needed to get to the game, then that person's decision to furnish the transportation must be obtained.¶ Complex problems, too, are subject to individual decision making. American business offers many examples of small companies that grew into major corporations while still under the individual control of the founder. Some computer companies that began in the 1970s as one-person operations burgeoned into multimillion-dollar corporations with the original inventor still making all the major decisions. And some of the multibillion-dollar leveraged buyouts of the 1980s were put together by daring—some would say greedy—financiers who made the day-to-day and even hour-to-hour decisions individually.¶ When President George H. W. Bush launched Operation Desert Storm, when President Bill Clinton sent troops into Somalia and Haiti and authorized Operation Desert Fox, and when President George W. Bush authorized Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq, they each used different methods of decision making, but in each case the ultimate decision was an individual one. In fact, many government decisions can be made only by the president. As Walter Lippmann pointed out, debate is the only satisfactory way the exact issues can be decided:¶ A president, whoever he is, has to find a way of understanding the novel and changing issues which he must, under the Constitution, decide. Broadly speaking ... the president has two ways of making up his mind. The one is to turn to his subordinates—to his chiefs of staff and his cabinet officers and undersecretaries and the like—and to direct them to argue out the issues and to bring him an agreed decision…¶ The other way is to sit like a judge at a hearing where the issues to be decided are debated. After he has heard the debate, after he has examined the evidence, after he has heard the debaters cross-examine one another, after he has questioned them himself he makes his decision…¶ It is a much harder method in that it subjects the president to the stress of feeling the full impact of conflicting views, and then to the strain of making his decision, fully aware of how momentous it Is. But there is no other satisfactory way by which momentous and complex issues can be decided.16¶ John F. Kennedy used Cabinet sessions and National Security Council meetings to provide debate to illuminate diverse points of view, expose errors, and challenge assumptions before he reached decisions.17 As he gained experience in office, he placed greater emphasis on debate. One historian points out: "One reason for the difference between the Bay of Pigs and the missile crisis was that [the Bay of Pig\*] fiasco instructed Kennedy in the importance of uninhibited debate in advance of major decision."18 All presidents, to varying degrees, encourage debate among their advisors.¶ We may never be called on to render the final decision on great issues of national policy, but we are constantly concerned with decisions important to ourselves for which debate can be applied in similar ways. That is, this debate may take place in our minds as we weigh the pros and cons of the problem, or we may arrange for others to debate the problem for us. Because we all are increasingly involved in the decisions of the campus, community, and society in general, it is in our intelligent self-interest to reach these decisions through reasoned debate.

#### ( ) Also the only portable skill – it outweighs any benefit achieved from their model of debate and turns the end goal of their praxis

Steinberg and Freely ‘8

[Austin – Civil Rights Attorney and David – Lecturer in Communication at Miami. Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, 2008, Pg 9-10]

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition.¶ Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions.¶ Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making homes from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations.¶ We all make many decisions even- day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car. what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate CO vote for. paper or plastic, all present lis with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration?¶ Is the defendant guilty as accused? Tlie Daily Show or the ball game? And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIMI: magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs. online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople. academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs?¶ The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates.¶ Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized.¶ Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others.¶ Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.

#### ( ) This is also an extinction DA to their model of debate – they produce advocates who are unable to *effectively deliberate* on behalf of their cause – that results in every catastrophic scenario imaginable

Lundberg ‘10

[Chris. Prof Communications at UNC-Chapel Hill. “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century, Ed. Louden. Pg 311]

The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. But the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech—as indicated earlier, debate builds capacity for critical thinking, analysis of public claims, informed decision making, and better public judgment. If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid scientific and technological change outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a puzzling solution, at best, to argue that these conditions warrant giving up on debate. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems place such a high premium on education (Dewey 1988,63, 154). Debate provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed about policy decisions that impact them, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them.¶ The merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources:¶ To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144)¶ Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim that debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of problem-solving skills demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials.¶ There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively, the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice in the classroom as a technology for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities. The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of meaningful political engagement and new articulations of democratic life.¶ Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to produce revisions of democratic life that are necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive. Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including: domestic and international issues of class, gender, and racial justice; wholesale environmental destruction and the potential for rapid climate change; emerging threats to international stability in the form of terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; and increasing challenges of rapid globalization including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, an informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill and sensitivity provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with the existential challenges to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.

### Pragmatism – Impact 2NC

#### Compromise with the norms of procedural democratic justice is the foundation of responsibility---their belief that their specific political agenda is more important than what we all chose as a topic is the root cause of bigotry and intolerance---this outweighs their argument:

#### A) Accesses their impact---topicality is the lynchpin of an ethic of switch-side debate that forces debaters to realize that there are two sides to every argument---being forced to defend things you don’t believe in accesses the baseline of tolerance and bigotry---and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is only caused because our institutions are populated with idiots – that’s our McClean evidence

#### B) It’s the only unique impact the debate---other forums like rallies and protests and \*the hallway\* are all better physical forums for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_. But only competitive debate instills in its participants an ethic of argumentative tolerance.

#### C) If we win the substance of this argument, it means that all of our impacts should precede theirs in your evaluation---the only way to preserve the ethic of tolerance and inclusion is to adhere to such procedures even if they are substantively accurate about their model of politics.

#### Now, pragmatism has nothing to do with framework or theory because we don’t say that the Aff should be forced to [ your interpretation ]. Our argument is one of political strategy – failure to have a plan means that the Aff cedes the political to other groups also fighting for change who have more definite ideas. McClean says this splinters efforts to fight oppression while well-organized reactionaries will fill the void – only a commitment to pragmatic political engagement solves.

#### ( ) Externally, abandoning political engagement causes extinction

Tallis ‘97

[Raymond. Prof of Geriatric Medicine @ U of Manchester. Enemies of Hope: A Critique of Contemporary Pessimism, 1997, Pg 407-409]

If we deny or rubbish the progress that mankind has already made, and at the same time are aware of the huge efforts mankind have made to ameliorate the human condition, we shall inevitably conclude that no progress is possible.  Such 'principled' despair will be a thousand times worse in terms of quietism than the most arrant care-nothing, do-nothing conservatism.  An attitude wavering between fatalism, cynicism and moral superiority may suit the purposes of humanist intellectuals who prefer the comfort of the seminar room to the relative discomfort of the places where the real work of bringing about a better future must take place.  It lets them morally off the hook - just as does the idea that there is no truth (only the dominant rhetoric of particular interpretive communities) and no genuine agency (only passivity in the seas of history, discourse, the unconscious, or whatever).  'Drooping despondency' makes very little demands on one's free time. 60  But we must refute those for whom (to parody Keats) 'the miseries are the world are misery and let them rest.'  For, as Medawar has pointed out, 61 although humans have been around for 500,000 years, it is only during the past 5,000 years that they have won any kind of reward for their special capabilities and only during the past 500 years have they begun to be, in the biological sense, a success.  'Only during the past 10 to 15 minutes of the human day has life on earth been anything but precarious.'  Technology has been really effective - because driven by science and a fundamental understanding of natural laws - only in the last 50 years.  Reason is a comparative newcomer in human affairs and a neonate in the history of living things. 62   Opposition in principle to the idea of progress, based upon assumptions about the nature of mankind - Original Sin, aggressive animal nature (ethology, Social-Darwinism), incurable irrationality (anthropology) - or about society (it is too deep to be understood, a collection of opaque forces rather than the summed actvity of human agents) - simply fails to see the whole story.  None of the theoretical reasons for denying the hope of progress is decisive.  Nor, it must be admitted, are there irrefutable reasons for assuming that progress is guaranteed or inevitable.  One would have to be a Hegelian or a Marxist to be stupid enough to believe that progress will come about of its own accord.  If we believe, as I believe, that it has to be brought about by human effort, human beings mobilising the abstract intelligence and universalizing goodwill that they uniquely possess, there is no certainty that the future will be better than the past.  So we are left with a secular equivalent of Pascal's wager, which I commend to the reader.   As Pascal pointed out, nobody can be absolutely certain that God exists.  We are in the position of best-guessing gamblers, making absolute and irreversible decisions in the context of uncertainty.  What, then, should we do?  Pascal recommends believing in God, for this will place the believer in a no-lose situation.  If he is right, then he will be appropriately rewarded when he meets his Maker face to face.  If he is wrong, he will not suffer for his credulity in the after-life of total oblivion.  If, on the other hand, he wagers on the non-existence of God, his reward, if there is no God after all, is to enjoy the same oblivion as the believer.  But if God really does exist, then he will be condemned to Eternal Damnation as punishment for his error.  Pascal's wager is not an entirely full or fair statement of the case, if only because there is quite a range of gods to choose from and the result of choosing the wrong one could be persecution on earth and damnation in the after-life.  Nor does it take account of the psychology of religious beliefs: the true experience of God should be (as Nijinsky proclaimed) 'a fire in the head' rather than the outcome of a prudent calculation of probabilities.  We can, however, usefully transpose Pascal's wager to the secular sphere and use it to think about the hope of progress.  If we believe in the possibility of progress, we may or not be successful in bringing it about.  But if we deny the possibility of progress, then, since it will not happen of its own accord, we shall ensure that progress shall most definitely not come about.  For the sake of the hungry child in the dust, we should not allow those who prophesy doom and gloom to speak unopposed; otherwise their prophecies will help to bring about their own hideous fulfilment.  And more hungry children will die in the dust, while the prophets of gloom, of course, continue to enjoy life in the library and the seminar room.   And perhaps for our own sake as well.  Once you throw away belief in progress and the desire to make progress - the passion to alleviate human suffering here and now and in the future, on a small scale and a large scale, locally and globally (and, as we denizens of the global village are aware, the distinction between these categories is not absolute) - then you have thrown away one of the deepest and most noble and fertile sources of goodness in human beings and, effectively, much of the underpinning of civilisation.  For a truly human culture is always - though never exclusively - preoccupied with improving the lot of mankind and in modern times this has taken the form of concern about justice for all, about the rights of the many, about enrichment of the poor and empowerment of the powerless.  Great, rich cultures have a generosity that is implicitly on the side of progress (even if it is not Utopian or explicitly progressive).  The only question for such cultures is whether progress is pursued well or badly, effectively or ineffectively.  As Medawar has said, 'The idea of improvement must be pretty well coeval with human speculative thought.  In one form of another it embodies almost the whole spiritual history of mankind.' 63   The enemies of hope have found their own reasons for dismissing the Enlightenment dream, without, perhaps fully realising what they are doing - or what they would be doing if the world took them seriously.  Hitherto, those who have rejected earthly happiness have had alternative, next-worldly, futures to look forward to.  In the absence of such alternatives, to dispense with the hope of progress, to mock 'the grand narratives of emancipation and enlightenment', is to lead humanity towards a collective despair perhaps unprecedented in articulate cultures.  Or, more likely, since even the most articulate pessimists are not notably lacking in personal ambition and concern for self-advancement, to set an example to the well-heeled sections of the race that will encourage them to pursue their own happiness and forget that of humanity as a whole.   For the sake of our humanity, then, as well as for the welfare of those whose lives would otherwise be Hell on earth, we must believe in, and strive for, progress, as did those noble philosophers of the Enlightenment. 64  'To deride the hope of progress', as Medawar says, 'is the ultimate fatuity, the last word in poverty of spirit and meanness of mind.'  This book has been written in the hope that such poverty of spirit and meanness of mind will not have the last word.

#### ( ) Your model of debate is narcissism – this creates inaction and allows resistant coalitions to *steamroll* your political strategy

Bryant ‘12

[Levi. Prof Philosophy at Collin College. “We’ll Never do better than a Politician: Climate Change and Purity” 5/11/12, <http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/> ]

In the language of my machine-oriented ontology or onticology, we would say that we only ever encounter local manifestations of hyperobjects, local events or appearances of hyperobjects, and never the hyperobject as such. Hyperobjects as such are purely virtual or withdrawn. They can’t be directly touched. And what’s worse, contrary to Locke’s principle of individuation whereby an individual is individuated by virtue of its location in a particular place and at a particular time, hyperobjects are without a site or place. They are, as Morton says, non-local. This, then, is a central problem, for how do you combat something that is everywhere and nowhere? How do you engage something that is non-local? If an army is over there I can readily target it. If a particular munitions factor is over here, then I can readily target it. But how do we target something that is non-local and that is incorporeal? This is the problem with occupying an abstraction.¶ Second, contemporary capitalism is massively redundant. This, I think, is what Wark is getting at when he speaks of contemporary power as “vectoral”. Under what Wark calls “vector power”, we have configurations of power where attacks at one site have very little impact insofar as flows can simply be re-channeled through another set of nodes in the network. Like a hydra, you cut off one head only to have another head appear in its place. The head can never be cut off once and for all because there is no single head.¶ The crisis of contemporary politics is thus the crisis of the erasure of site. In the age of hyperobjects, we come to dwell in a world where there is no clear site of political antagonism and therefore no real sense of how and where to engage.¶ Here I’m also inclined to say that we need to be clear about system references in our political theorizing and action. We think a lot about the content of our political theorizing and positions, but I don’t think we think a lot about how our political theories are supposed to actually act in the world. As a result, much contemporary leftist political theory ends up in a performative contradiction. It claims, following Marx, that it’s aim is not to represent the world but to change it, yet it never escapes the burrows of academic journals, conferences, and presses to actually do so. Like the Rat-Man’s obsessional neurosis where his actions in returning the glasses were actually designed to fail, there seems to be a built in tendency in these forms of theorization to unconsciously organize their own failure. And here I can’t resist suggesting that this comes as no surprise given that, in Lacanian terms, the left is the position of the hysteric and as such has “a desire for an unsatisfied desire”. In such circumstances the worst thing consists in getting what you want. We on the left need to traverse our fantasy so as to avoid this sterile and self-defeating repetition; and this entails shifting from the position of political critique (hysterical protest), to political construction– actually envisioning and building alternatives.¶ So what’s the issue with system-reference? The great autopoietic sociological systems theorist, Niklas Luhmann, makes this point nicely. For Luhmann, there are intra-systemic references and inter-systemic references. Intra-systemic references refer to processes that are strictly for the sake of reproducing or maintaining the system in question. Take the example of a cell. A cell, for-itself, is not for anything beyond itself. The processes that take place within the cell are simply for continuing the existence of the cell across time. While the cell might certainly emit various chemicals and hormones as a result of these processes, from its own intra-systemic perspective, it is not for the sake of affecting these other cells with those hormones. They’re simply by-products. Capitalism or economy is similar. Capitalists talk a good game about benefiting the rest of the world through the technologies they produce, the medicines they create (though usually it’s government and universities that invent these medicines), the jobs they create, etc., but really the sole aim of any corporation is identical to that of a cell: to endure through time or reproduce itself through the production of capital. This production of capital is not for anything and does not refer to anything outside itself. These operations of capital production are intra-systemic. By contrast, inter-systemic operations would refer to something outside the system and its auto-reproduction. They would be for something else.¶ Luhmann argues that every autopoietic system has this sort of intra-systemic dimension. Autopoietic systems are, above all, organized around maintaining themselves or enduring. This raises serious questions about academic political theory. Academia is an autopoietic system. As an autopoietic system, it aims to endure, reproduce itself, etc. It must engage in operations or procedures from moment to moment to do so. These operations consist in the production of students that eventually become scholars or professors, the writing of articles, the giving of conferences, the production of books and classes, etc. All of these are operations through which the academic system maintains itself across time. The horrifying consequence of this is that the reasons we might give for why we do what we do might (and often) have little to do with what’s actually taking place in system continuance. We say that our articles are designed to demolish capital, inequality, sexism, homophobia, climate disaster, etc., but if we look at how this system actually functions we suspect that the references here are only intra-systemic, that they are only addressing the choir or other academics, that they are only about maintaining that system, and that they never proliferate through the broader world. Indeed, our very style is often a big fuck you to the rest of the world as it requires expert knowledge to be comprehended, thereby insuring that it can have no impact on broader collectives to produce change. Seen in this light, it becomes clear that our talk about changing the world is a sort of alibi, a sort of rationalization, for a very different set of operations that are taking place. Just as the capitalist says he’s trying to benefit the world, the academic tries to say he’s trying to change the world when all he’s really doing is maintaining a particular operationally closed autopoietic system. How to break this closure is a key question for any truly engaged political theory. And part of breaking that closure will entail eating some humble pie. Adam Kotsko wrote a wonderful and hilarious post on the absurdities of some political theorizing and its self-importance today. We’ve failed horribly with university politics and defending the humanities, yet in our holier-than-thou attitudes we call for a direct move to communism. Perhaps we need to reflect a bit on ourselves and our strategies and what political theory should be about.¶ Setting all this aside, I think there’s a danger in Wark’s claims about abstraction (though I think he’s asking the right sort of question). The danger in treating hyperobjects like capitalism as being everywhere and nowhere is that our ability to act becomes paralyzed. As a materialist, I’m committed to the thesis that everything is ultimately material and requires some sort of material embodiment. If that’s true, it follows that there are points of purchase on every object, even where that object is a hyperobject. This is why, given the current form that power takes or the age of hyperobjects, I believe that forms of theory such as new materialism, object-oriented ontology, and actor-network theory are more important than ever (clearly the Whiteheadians are out as they see everything as internally related, as an organism, and therefore have no way of theorizing change and political engagement; they’re quasi-Hegelian, justifying even the discord in the world as a part of “god’s” selection and harmonization of intensities).¶ The important thing to remember is that hyperobjects like capitalism are unable to function without a material base. They require highways, shipping routes, trains and railroads, fiber optic cables for communication, and a host of other things besides. Without what Shannon Mattern calls “infrastructure”, it’s impossible for this particular hyperobject exists. Every hyperobject requires its arteries. Information, markets, trade, require the paths along which they travel and capitalism as we know it today would not be possible without its paths. The problem with so much political theory today is that it focuses on the semiosphere in the form of ideologies, discourses, narratives, laws, etc., ignoring the arteries required for the semiosphere to exercise its power. For example, we get OWS standing in front of Wall Street protesting– engaging in a speech act –yet one wonders if speech is an adequate way of addressing the sort of system we exist in. Returning to system’s theory, is the system of capital based on individual decisions of bankers and CEO’s, or does the system itself have its own cognition, it’s own mode of action, that they’re ineluctably trapped in? Isn’t there a sort of humanist prejudice embodied in this form of political engagement? It has value in that it might create larger collectives of people to fight these intelligent aliens that live amongst us (markets, corporations, etc), but it doesn’t address these aliens themselves because it doesn’t even acknowledge their existence.¶ What we need is a politics adequate to hyperobjects, and that is above all a politics that targets arteries. OOO, new materialism, and actor-network theory are often criticized for being “apolitical” by people who are fascinated with political declarations, who are obsessed with showing that your papers are in order, that you’ve chosen the right team, and that see critique and protest as the real mode of political engagement. But it is not clear what difference these theorists are making and how they are escaping intra-systemic self-reference and auto-reproduction. But the message of these orientations is “to the things themselves!”, “to the assemblages themselves!” “Quit your macho blather about where you stand, and actually map power and how it exercises itself!” And part of this re-orientation of politics, if it exists, consists in rendering deconstruction far more concrete. Deconstruction would no longer show merely the leaks in any system and its diacritical oppositions, it would go to the things themselves. What does that mean? It means that deconstruction would practice onto-cartography or identify the arteries by which capitalism perpetuates itself and find ways to block them. You want to topple the 1% and get their attention? Don’t stand in front of Wall Street and bitch at bankers and brokers, occupy a highway. Hack a satellite and shut down communications. Block a port. Erase data banks, etc. Block the arteries; block the paths that this hyperobject requires to sustain itself. This is the only way you will tilt the hands of power and create bargaining power with government organs of capital and corporations. You have to hit them where they live, in their arteries. Did anyone ever change their diet without being told that they would die? Your critique is an important and indispensable step, but if you really wish to produce change you need to find ways to create heart attacks and aneurysms. Short of that, your activity is just masturbation. But this requires coming to discern where the arteries are and doing a little less critique of cultural artifacts and ideologies. Yet choose your targets carefully. The problem with the Seattle protests was that they chose idiotic targets and simply acted on impotent rage. A window is not an artery. It doesn’t organize a flow of communication and capital. It’s the arteries that you need to locate. I guess this post will get Homeland Security after me.

### Predictable, Limited Discussion – Impact 2NC

#### Limits DA – The aff interpretation explodes the number of potential affirmatives to anything that has a loose relationship to transportation, making it impossible for the negative to engage in crucial pre-deliberate research and provide robust in-debate clash

#### Limits 1st:

#### A. Fair Division of Ground - We can’t read disads and solvency arguments if they don’t defend the aff instrumentally. All we get is counter-warrant debates, which always favor the affirmative.

#### B. It’s the internal link to every other impact- A manageable and predictable set of affirmatives are key to deep and clash-heavy debates that cultivate critical thinking skills- turns their activism arguments.

#### C. Prevents intellectual balkanization – If we could talk about anything, each team would retreat to the corner of academia that makes them feel most comfortable – a bounded area for debate challenges debates to expand their intellectual horizons without making the task seem unmanageable.

#### D. Limits may be restrictive, but learning to work within them is liberating - Limits are an inevitable aspect of human biology and society, so learning to work and be creative within these limits is essential. Debate offers another way to practice working within a necessarily limited human existence.

#### ( ) Hanjhog says limits determine fairness – debate’s impossible if the rules aren’t reciprocal and predictable. Only a fair decision-making forum produces academic growth – this outweighs any other benefit to your model of debate

Pearce 7

(Pearce, Nick, March-May 2007, “Fair Rules: Rethinking Fairness”, director of International Public Policy Research, Public Policy Research, Volume 14, Issue 1)

In the 1970s, social psychologists began to develop theories of procedural justice in order to understand behavioural responses to different ways of resolving conflicts over resources and the allocation of goods and services. This ‘third wave of justice research’, as it has been described (Tyler et al 1997), studied whether evaluations of the fairness of decision-making processes impacted on reactions to the outcomes of those processes, that is, to the question of who gets what. Researchers discovered that, counterintuitively, people will accept outcomes that are negative or adverse for them personally, if they believe that the manner by which they were arrived at was fair. For example, Thibaut and Walker’s pioneering study (1975) of adversarial and inquisitional legal systems found that people choose dispute resolution mechanisms that they think will be fair and yield a fair outcome, rather than those that might stand them the best chance of winning. Similarly, they found that people are more satisfied with trial procedures that they experience as fair, regardless of the trial outcome. Subsequent procedural justice research demonstrated that people care about the fairness of procedures in a wide range of settings: from trial procedures to arbitration mechanisms, performancerelated pay at work and police-citizen interactions (Tyler 1990; Tyler et al 1997; Tyler and Fagan 2006). Moreover, not only are people more satisfied with procedures they deem to be fair, and more readily accept the outcomes of them, but their loyalty and willingness to help the organisation concerned also improves. Fair procedures and fair treatment generate loyalty and cooperation.

#### Now, there’s an independent predictability disadvantage – even if they’re right that a discussion of [ their aff ] is limited, we have proven that it isn’t predictable because it’s not related to transportation infrastructure investment. That should frame your decision – no project can be worthwhile if we can’t anticipate it before we discuss it. Predictability outweighs:

#### A. Fosters productive debates – We need to be prepared to discuss the aff to maximize debate’s potential to foster critical thinking. If we cannot predict the affirmative, debates become shallow and devoid of their educational potential

#### B. Generates *portable and meaningful* education – Most of debate’s value comes beforewe ever enter the room – the process of researching potential affirmatives forces us to re-consider personal beliefs and develop a thicker, more robust view of the world. Your model of debate prevents that – That’s Goodin and Niemeyer, and more evidence that without pre-round consideration of the meaning of the topic, debates are meaningless

Goodin and Niemeyer ‘3

[Robert and Simon – of the Australian National University. “When Does Deliberation Begin?” Political Studies, Vol 51. 2003. Ebsco]

Certainly, ‘consideration’ necessarily comes temporally prior to ‘discussion’. An internal process of weighing of reasons necessarily precedes any participation in a public discursive interchange. That, after all, is how we decide what position to take in the ensuing public discussion. Ideals of deliberative democracy may require that we go into public discussions with an ‘open mind’, in the sense of a willingness to change our opinions in the light of subsequent evidence and argument. But if everyone came to the process with a completely open mind, to the extent that no one was prepared to take any position to start with, the deliberations would have nowhere to begin. Internal-reflective processes are also involved in responding to the arguments and evidence presented by others in discussion. Much of the work in understanding what others are saying, whether in a formal meeting or an everyday conversation, inevitably occurs inside our own heads. We ‘get’ their jokes, catch their allusions, complete their ‘conversational implicatures’, fill in suppressed premises of their argument-sketches, and so on (Grice, 1975; Mansbridge, 1999). Empathetic extensions of that sort are crucial in enabling us to make sense of one another over the course of discussions, democratic or otherwise. So too, we argue, do they loom large in the run-up to those discussions. And so too might they do likewise, we suggest, even in the absence of any formal discussions. Imagining ourselves in the place of another for purposes of trying to understand what the other is saying is broadly of a cloth with imagining ourselves in the place of another for purposes of trying to understand what the other is or might be feeling or desiring (Goodin, 2000, 2003). The motivations might be different. But the process is broadly the same.10 As a modest step toward establishing those larger arguments, we here examine how deliberations actually proceeded in a citizens’ jury on an Australian environmental issue. There, just as our model of ‘democratic deliberation within’ hypothesizes, deliberation of the more internal-reflective sort did indeed precede – and did indeed do more to change people’s attitudes than – formal group deliberations of the more discursive sort.

## Answers to Their Answers

### Switch Side Debate Good – 1st Line

#### ( ) Switch Side debate is key to decision-making – that skill is key to solve extinction level threats

Harrigan ‘8

[Casey. NDT Champion, Director of Debate at MSU. “A Defense of Switch Side Debate” http://dspace.zsr.wfu.edu/jspui/bitstream/10339/207/1/harrigancd052008, p. 57-59 1998]

Along these lines, the greatest benefit of switching sides, which goes to the heart of contemporary debate, is its inducement of critical thinking. Defined as “reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, 1987, p. 10), critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how advocate and argue, but how to decide as well. Each and every student, whether in debate or (more likely) at some later point in life, will be placed in the position of the decision-maker. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice, compare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which is preferable. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave. As Robert Crawford notes, there are “issues of unsurpassed importance in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people…being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking” (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that “the next Pearl Harbor could be ‘compounded by hydrogen’” (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p. 3) is greatly reduced, the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq in 2003 points to the continuing necessity of training a well-informed and critically-aware public (Zarefsky, 2007). In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant but ambitious politicians and persuasive but nefarious leaders would be much more likely to draw the country, and possibly the world, into conflicts with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad threats of global proportions that will require incisive solutions, including global warming, the spread of pandemic diseases, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cultivating a robust and effective society of critical decision-makers is essential. As Louis Rene Beres writes, “with such learning, we Americans could prepare…not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet” (2003). Thus, it is not surprising that critical thinking has been called “the highest educational goal of the activity” (Parcher, 1998). While arguing from conviction can foster limited critical thinking skills, the element of switching sides is necessary to sharpen debate’s critical edge and ensure that decisions are made in a reasoned manner instead of being driven by ideology. Debaters trained in SSD are more likely to evaluate both sides of an argument before arriving at a conclusion and are less likely to dismiss potential arguments based on his or her prior beliefs (Muir 1993). In addition, debating both sides teaches “conceptual flexibility,” where decision-makers are more likely to reflect upon the beliefs that are held before coming to a final opinion (Muir, 1993, p. 290). Exposed to many arguments on each side of an issue, debaters learn that public policy is characterized by extraordinary complexity that requires careful consideration before action. Finally, these arguments are confirmed by the preponderance of empirical research demonstrating a link between competitive SSD and critical thinking (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt and Louden, 1999; Colbert, 2002, p. 82).

#### ( ) Switch side prevents fundamentalism and scape-goating—our framework is key to foster inclusion

Harrigan ‘8

[Casey. NDT Champion, Director of Debate at MSU. “A Defense of Switch Side Debate” http://dspace.zsr.wfu.edu/jspui/bitstream/10339/207/1/harrigancd052008, p. 57-59 1998]

Argumentative pluralism can be defined as the proper tolerance for the expression of a diversity of ideas (Scriven 1975, p. 694). Contrary to monism, pluralism holds that there are many potential beliefs in the world and that each person has the ability to determine for himself or herself that these beliefs may hold true. Referring back to the opening examples, a pluralist would respect the right for the KKK to hold certain beliefs, 44 even if he or she may find the group offensive. In the argumentative context, pluralism requires that participants to a debate or discussion recognize the right of others to express their beliefs, no matter how objectionable they may be. The key here is expression: although certain beliefs may be more “true” than others in the epistemic sense, each should have equal access (at least initially) to forums of deliberation. It is important to distinguish pluralism from its commonly confused, but only loosely connected, counterpart, relativism. To respect the right of others to hold different beliefs does not require that they are all considered equal. Such tolerance ends at the intellectual level of each individual being able to hold their own belief. Indeed, as Muir writes, “It [pluralism] implies neither tolerance of actions based on those beliefs nor respecting the content of the beliefs” (288). Thus, while a pluralist may acknowledge the right for the Klan to hold exclusionary views, he or she need not endorse racism or anti-Semitism itself, or the right to exclude itself. Even when limited to such a narrow realm of diversity, argumentative pluralism holds great promise for a politics based on understanding and accommodation that runs contrary to the dominant forces of economic, political, and social exclusion. Pluralism requires that individuals acknowledge opposing beliefs and arguments by forcing an understanding that personal convictions are not universal. Instead of blindly asserting a position as an “objective Truth,” advocates tolerate a multiplicity of perspectives, allowing a more panoramic understanding of the issue at hand (Mitchell and Suzuki 2004, p. 10). In doing so, the advocates frequently understand that there are persuasive arguments to be had on both sides of an issue. As a result, instead of advancing a cause through moralistic posturing or appeals to a falsely assumed universality (which, history 45 has shown, frequently become justifications for scape-goating and exclusion), these proponents become purveyors of reasoned arguments that attempt to persuade others through deliberation. A clear example of this occurs in competitive academic debate. Switch-side debating has profound implications for pluralism. Personal convictions are supplemented by conviction in the process of debate. Instead of being personally invested in the truth and general acceptance of a position, debaters use arguments instrumentally, as tools, and as pedagogical devices in the search for larger truths. Beyond simply recognizing that more than one side exists for each issue, switch-side debate advances the larger cause of equality by fostering tolerance and empathy toward difference. Setting aside their own “ego-identification,” students realize that they must listen and understand their opponent’s arguments well enough to become advocates on behalf of them in future debates (Muir 1993, p. 289). Debaters assume the position of their opponents and understand how and why the position is constructed as it is. As a result, they often come to understand that a strong case exists for opinions that they previously disregarded. Recently, advocates of switch side debating have taken the case of the practice a step further, arguing that it, “originates from a civic attitude that serves as a bulwark against fundamentalism of all stripes” (English, Llano, Mitchell, Morrison, Rief and Woods 2007, p. 224). Debating practices that break down exclusive, dogmatic views may be one of the most robust checks against violence in contemporary society

### AT//Counter-Interpretations of “Resolved”

#### “Resolved” before the colon signifies that debate should model a legislative forum. This is best – it’s grammatically correct, which determines predictability. Also, any offense we win against their model of debate is a DA to their counterinterpretation.

#### ( ) Resolved means an immediate legislative question

Robert ‘15

[General Henry M. Robert, US Army, 1915  [http://www.bartleby.com/176/4.html](http://www.bartleby.com/176/4.html#_blank)]

A motion is a proposal that the assembly take certain action, or that it express itself as holding certain views. It is made by a member's obtaining the floor as already described and saying, "I move that" (which is equivalent to saying, "I propose that"), and then stating the action he proposes to have taken. Thus a member "moves" (proposes) that a resolution be adopted, or amended, or referred to a committee, or that a vote of thanks be extended, etc.; or "That it is the sense of this meeting (or assembly) that industrial training," etc. Every resolution should be in writing, and the presiding officer has a right to require any main motion, amendment, or instructions to a committee to be in writing. When a main motion is of such importance or length as to be in writing it is usually written in the form of a resolution; that is, beginning with the words, "Resolved, That," the word "*Resolved* " being underscored (printed in italics) and followed by a comma, and the word "That" beginning with a capital "T." If the word "Resolved" were replaced by the words "I move," the resolution would become a motion. A resolution is always a main motion. In some sections of the country the word "resolve" is frequently used instead of "resolution." In assemblies with paid employees, instructions given to employees are called "orders" instead of "resolutions," and the enacting word, "Ordered" is used instead of "Resolved." [continues] After a question has been stated by the chair, it is before the assembly for consideration and action. All resolutions, reports of committees, communications to the assembly, and all amendments proposed to them, and all other motions except the Undebatable Motions mentioned in 45, may be debated before final action is taken on them, unless by a two-thirds vote the assembly decides to dispose of them without debate. By a two-thirds vote is meant two-thirds of the votes cast, a quorum being present. In the debate each member has the right to speak twice on the same question on the same day (except on an appeal), but cannot make a second speech on the same question as long as any member who has not spoken on that question desires the floor. No one can speak longer than ten minutes at a time without permission of the assembly. Debate must be limited to the merits of the immediately pending question — that is, the last question stated by the chair that is still pending; except that in a few cases the main question is also open to debate [[45](http://www.bartleby.com/176/45.html#_blank)]. Speakers must address their remarks to the presiding officer, be courteous in their language and deportment, and avoid all personalities, never alluding to the officers or other members by name, where possible to avoid it, nor to the motives of members.

#### ( ) Resolved expresses a legislative decision

WP ‘64

[Words and Phrases, Permanent Edition. 1964]

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### ( ) More evidence -

PARCHER 2001

(Jeff, Fmr. Debate Coach at Georgetown University, February, http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html)

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution. Affirmative and negative are the equivalents of 'yes' or 'no' - which, of course, are answers to a question.

### AT//Counter-Interpretations of “USFG Should”

#### The phrase “the United States federal government should” means the resolutional question presupposes a governmental policy response. This is best – it’s grammatically correct, which determines predictability. Also, any offense we win against their model of debate is a DA to their counterinterpretation.

### AT//Counter-Interpretations of “Federal Government”

#### You are not the government. The federal government refers to the components of the government located mostly in Washington DC – people like Congressional representatives, various government agencies, and the President. Our AHD evidence is comparative and says that the government and its components are separate things. Any counterinterpretation links to all of our offense because it changes the way we understand the starting point of debate.

#### ( ) More evidence – the federal government is the central governing authority of the United States

AHD ‘92

[The American Heritage Dictionary. 1992]

Federal Government: Of, relating to, or being a form of government in which a union of states recognizes the sovereignty of a central authority while retaining certain residual powers of government.

### AT//We Defend the Resolution

#### You are not an adequate defense of the resolution – our definitions of resolved, should, and substantial prove that you must instrumentally defend the plan – not defending a policy links to all the reasons debating the resolution is good

#### At worst, they are extra topical – even if they arbitrarily chose to give us some links they will still claim advantages based off of the discursive appeal of the affirmative. Extra topicality means they can have thousands of unpredictable advantages based on the extra topical nature of their plan. You should reject the team for this, otherwise it’s a no-cost option and we have to impact-turn their stuff just to get back to square one.

### AT//The Resolution’s a Story

#### ( ) Not falsifiable – we can’t negate a story. How could we? Do we tell a different story? Seems like the permutation would solve. Do we say you are a bad storyteller? That’s arbitrary. Do we read disadvantages to your story? I bet you’d say they don’t link. Cut a literary criticism of your author? This proves that they link to all our dialogue and predictability offense.

#### ( ) Our interpretation solves this – you can use stories, analogies, and music to support the passage of a policy option. This is best because we can still reasonably attempt to debate the case by persuading the judge that disadvantages to the plan outweigh and disprove your narrative.

### AT//The Resolution’s Oppressive

#### ( ) The resolution’s not oppressive – there’s a fair and democratic process that goes into selecting it. Topic papers are submitted to the National Federation of State High Schools Association. Their committee selects roughly a dozen of these, and they are debated and refined at the topic committee meeting every August. This is a meeting that anyone can attend and in which every state is represented. That committee ultimately selects five topics that every state ranks in preferential order. This process is repeated for the final two topics. We shouldn’t need evidence to refute the claim that “the elite choose the topic,” but we’ll read a card anyway

Parcher ‘1

[Jeff. Former DOD at Georgetown. “Is the Resolution a Question?” Post to the eDebate Listserv, <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html> 2001]

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. ¶ (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statement of a decision, as by a legislature. ¶ (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. ¶ (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

#### ( ) We should have a limiting resolution – it ensures that words have meaning and the topic is narrow enough for us to debate

Kemerling ‘97

[Garth. Prof Philosophy at Newberry. 1997, [www.philosophypages.com/lg/e05,htmn](http://www.philosophypages.com/lg/e05,htmn) ]

We've seen that sloppy or misleading use of ordinary language can **seriously limit our ability to** create and **communicate** correct reasoning. As philosopher John Locke pointed out three centuries ago, the achievement of human knowledge is often hampered by the use of words without fixed signification. **Needless controversy is sometimes produced and perpetuated** by an unacknowledged ambiguity in the application of key terms. We can distinguish disputes of three sorts: Genuine disputes involve disagreement about whether or not some specific proposition is true. Since the people engaged in a genuine dispute agree on the meaning of the words by means of which they convey their respective positions, each of them can propose and assess logical arguments that might eventually lead to a resolution of their differences. Merely verbal disputes, on the other hand, arise entirely from ambiguities in the language used to express the positions of the disputants. A verbal dispute disappears entirely once the people involved arrive at an agreement on the meaning of their terms, since doing so reveals their underlying agreement in belief. Apparently verbal but really genuine disputes can also occur, of course. In cases of this sort, the resolution of every ambiguity only reveals an underlying genuine dispute. Once that's been discovered, it can be addressed fruitfully by appropriate methods of reasoning. We can save a lot of time, sharpen our reasoning abilities, and communicate with each other more effectively if we watch for disagreements about the meaning of words and **try to resolve them whenever we can**. Kinds of Definition The most common way of preventing or eliminating differences in the use of languages is by **agreeing on the definition of our terms**. Since these explicit accounts of the meaning of a word or phrase can be offered in distinct contexts and employed in the service of different goals, it's useful to distinguish definitions of several kinds: A lexical definition simply reports the way in which a term is already used within a language community. The goal here is to inform someone else of the accepted meaning of the term, so the definition is more or less correct depending upon the accuracy with which it captures that usage. In these pages, my definitions of technical terms of logic are lexical because they are intended to inform you about the way in which these terms are actually employed within the discipline of logic. At the other extreme, a stipulative definition freely assigns meaning to a completely new term, creating a usage that had never previously existed. Since the goal in this case is to propose the adoption of shared use of a novel term, there are no existing standards against which to compare it, and the definition is always correct (though it might fail to win acceptance if it turns out to be inapt or useless). If I now decree that we will henceforth refer to Presidential speeches delivered in French as "glorsherfs," I have made a (probably pointless) stipulative definition. Combining these two techniques is often an effective way to reduce the vagueness of a word or phrase. These precising definitions begin with the lexical definition of a term but then propose to **sharpen it by stipulating more narrow limits on its use**. Here, the lexical part must be correct and the stipulative portion should appropriately reduce the troublesome vagueness. If the USPS announces that "proper notification of a change of address" means that an official form containing the relevant information must be received by the local post office no later than four days prior to the effective date of the change, it has offered a (possibly useful) precising definition.

### AT//Affirmative Choice

#### ( ) Yes – affirmative choice – within the confines of the topic – you don’t just get to talk about whatever you want – we’ve read a slew of DAs to that.

#### ( ) Topicality comes before aff choice – this justifies the arg that the aff can chose how many time the neg speaks, or can decide what the 1nc is – if we win their choice is a bad framework they should lose – or else you allow millions of unpredictable choices that make being neg impossible

#### ( ) Also, there is not logical basis for this. Negative choice makes more sense – you can read your argument when you’re negative – it’s best because negation theory doesn’t tie you to the rez.

### AT//Narratives / Poems

#### ( ) They don’t meet our interpretation. Only our interpretation is based off the definition of the resolutional phrases – even if their interpretation is important, it’s not predictable and sets no limit on the topic. All that work was above – they don’t meet Resolved, Should, Substantial, or Federal Government – means they link to every piece of offense we’ve read.

#### ( ) We have an independent disad to their counter-interpretation – personal narratives prevent effective debate and discussion and destroy the public sphere by creating a sense of expertise- multiple studies prove

Levasseur and Carlin ‘1

(David G. Levasseur is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at West Chester University in West Chester, Pennsylvania. Diana B. Carlin is Professor of Communication Studies and Dean of the Graduate School and International Programs at the University of Kansas, “Egocentric Argument and the Public Sphere: Citizen Deliberations on Public Policy and Policymakers”, Rhetoric & Public Affairs 4.3 (2001) 407-43, Muse, 2001, )

While the personal narratives from participants in the study certainly seemed to spark enthusiasm, such engagement came at a significant cost. As with other forms of egocentric argument, narratives that focus on the self are largely unable to steer the conversation towards more transcendent communal outcomes. A group discussion in Ohio reveals this characteristic of personal narratives. In this particular discussion, participants actively debated the issue of whether government should support labor unions: M1: I don't think the unions are going to be wiped out, first of all. And I'm not a proponent of unions. I'm basically anti-union, okay? . . . However, by the same token, unions have got to work the same way in being fair to companies, and I've seen situations where unions, because of some of the things they did, were a disgrace. Perry Power Plant--I know people who were told to go hide--I have nothing to do--go hide. That's WRONG! Okay, I've seen situations where a person, because he's in the union and he has this job classification, then he can't do anything else and he's sitting there for six and a half of his eight hours because he's only needed to do these two things, but he's got to be there because nobody else can do it because the unions state that you've got to have a person to do this and a person to do this and so on. M2: Well, that's his trade though. What do you do? M1: I'm an accountant but I do a lot of other things other than just accounting things. M2: Well, what if somebody came in and tried to take your job--take your livelihood? Something you've trained for, you're second, third generation of this particular . . . M1: Yeah, but I can't be allowed to sit around for six and a half hours out of the eight hours when I could be doing something else but I can't do it because . . . M2: No, that's not my point. [End Page 414] M1: Well, that's my point! If I could do something productive to help the company to help me to help the workers the other six and a half hours, but I'm not allowed to do that because that's not my job classification. Then I'm qualified, I can do it, but I'm not allowed. . . . M2: What about prevailing wage with unions? M1: What do you mean? M2: Well, usually non-union companies are--they gauge their pay scale to union companies with prevailing wage. So if one day, if the prevailing wage with union companies--if it falls and it's gone, then what do you think will happen to the rest of the wages? When the union prevailing wage is wiped out? In this discussion, participants actively debated the issue of whether government should support labor unions; however, they reached no mutual conclusions on the value of labor unions. Divergent opinions were shared, but no attempt at consensus building regarding the role of unions in the economy occurred. Consensus was difficult because when one focuses on self-experience, it is difficult to transcend those experiences. While the conversation raised a number of points on behalf of unions, the anti-union storyteller continued to return to his story. Habermas argues that the public sphere should constitute a discursive space where individuals "transcend the provinciality of their spatiotemporal contexts"--a space where citizens engage in "context transcending validity claims." 39 When citizens ground public policy discussions in personal narratives, they generally fail to transcend the limitations of their personal lives and move to a broader social outlook. It is also interesting to note that in this exchange about unions the personal narrative goes unchallenged. Rhetorical theorists have long recognized that narratives are susceptible to the charge of ungeneralizable evidence. For instance, Richard Whatley observed that one must take care in constructing arguments from examples, because examples are perceived as "exceptions to a general rule" and "will not prove the probability of the conclusion." 40 While such a perception may prove fatal in debates between experts in the technical sphere, they do not seem to have much impact in the deliberative practices of ordinary citizens. In the foregoing exchange, one participant recounted his personal experiences with union workers at the Perry Power Plant. He told the story of union workers who spent endless hours in idleness or in hiding. While one could certainly challenge the generalizability of such a story, the other group members did not offer such challenges. Instead, a pro-union participant shifted the ground of the debate to the alternative issue of "prevailing wage," where the discussion died. Perhaps such personal narratives are difficult to challenge because they establish expertise. Recent scholarly outcry suggests that experts have usurped the public [End Page 415] sphere. 41 Such lamentations are grounded in the fear that technical expertise undermines citizen deliberation by devaluing citizens' views. While this incursion by technical expertise did find its way into the group discussions (citizens citing outside "expert" sources), personally grounded expertise, such as the credibility established in the following exchange from a group in California, appeared far more often: M1: I think they should really look into the military spending. That is just amazing. I was in the military, and it's just a waste. People just rot in the military. It's just amazing how much unnecessary money is used in the military, and how many people that shouldn't have jobs are in the military. M2: That's the Republican job program. M3: I think you can say that about any government organization. In this exchange, a participant recounted his personal experience in the military. With the simple statement, "I was in the military," he established expertise in this realm of public affairs. Just as technical expertise quells discussion, personal expertise has similar effects. In this case, the assertion that "people rot in the military" went unchallenged, and the discussion of military spending quickly came to an end. Such personal credibility may also be less assailable than technical expertise because of its deeply personal nature. Arguments grounded in technical expertise can be challenged for their failure to satisfy certain argumentation standards within a specialized argument field. For instance, a social scientist's findings could be challenged based on a flaw in experimental design. Such a challenge takes issue with the findings; it does not fundamentally take issue with the individual. On the other hand, a challenge to one's lived experience is easily perceived as a challenge to one's life or to one's character. Such challenges can only suggest that one is disingenuous in his or her storytelling or that one's lived experience falls outside the norm. Such challenges seem out of place in a culture grounded in a liberal political tradition that suggests that one should not judge others. 42

### AT//Hip Hop

#### ( ) Hip hop is inevitably marketed to white consumers- turns black culture into a commodity that can be tossed away

Hartigan ‘5

[John. Prof Anthro UC-Santa Cruz. “Culture Against Race: Reworking the Basis for Racial Analysis” South Atlantic Quarterly, Vol 104, No3. 2005. Ebsco]

One might be tempted to assume that Gilroy’s stance is largely polemical, but his critique is thoroughgoing, as is his call to reject ‘‘this desire to cling on to ‘race’ and go on stubbornly and unimaginatively seeing the world on the distinctive scales that it has specified.’’ In spite of powerful, novel efforts to fundamentally transform racial analysis—such as the emergence of ‘‘whiteness studies’’ or analyses of the ‘‘new racism’’—Gilroy is emphatic in ‘‘demand[ing] liberation not from white supremacy alone, however urgently that is required, but from all racializing and raciological thought, fromracialized seeing, racialized thinking, and racialized thinking about thinking’’ (40). In contrast to Visweswaran—and, interestingly, voicing concerns over ‘‘cultural politics’’ that resonate with Dominguez’s critique—Gilroy sees a host of problems in ‘‘black political cultures’’ that rely on ‘‘essentialist approaches to building solidarity’’ (38).14 Nor does he share Harrison’s confidence in making racism the centerpiece of critical cultural analysis. Gilroy plainly asserts that ‘‘the starting point of this book is that the era of New Racism is emphatically over’’ (34). A singular focus on racism precludes an attention to ‘‘the appearance of sharp intraracial conflicts’’ and does not effectively address the ‘‘several new forms of determinism abroad’’ (38, 34). We still must be prepared ‘‘to give effective answers to the pathological problems represented by genomic racism, the glamour of sameness, and the eugenic projects currently nurtured by their confluence’’ (41). But the diffuse threats posed by invocations of racially essentialized identities (shimmering in ‘‘the glamour of sameness’’) as the basis for articulating ‘‘black political cultures’’ entails an analytical approach that countervails against positing racism as the singular focus of inquiry and critique.15 From Gilroy’s stance, to articulate a ‘‘postracial humanism’’ we must disable any form of racial vision and ensure that it can never again be reinvested with explanatory power. But what will take its place as a basis for talking about the dynamics of belonging and differentiation that profoundly shape social collectives today? Gilroy tries to make clear that it will not be ‘‘culture,’’ yet this concept infuses his efforts to articulate an alternative conceptual approach. Gilroy conveys many of the same reservations about culture articulated by the anthropologists listed above. Specifically, Gilroy cautions that ‘‘the culturalist approach still runs the risk of naturalizing and normalizing hatred and brutality by presenting them as inevitable consequences of illegitimate attempts to mix and amalgamate primordially incompatible groups’’ (27). In contrast, Gilroy expressly prefers the concept of diaspora as a means to ground a new form of attention to collective identities. ‘‘As an alternative to the metaphysics of ‘race,’ nation, and bounded culture coded into the body,’’ Gilroy finds that ‘‘diaspora is a concept that problematizes the cultural and historical mechanics of belonging’’ (123). Furthermore, ‘‘by focusing attention equally on the sameness within differentiation and the differentiation within sameness, diaspora disturbs the suggestion that political and cultural identity might be understood via the analogy of indistinguishable peas lodged in the protective pods of closed kinship and subspecies’’ (125). And yet, in a manner similar to Harrison’s prioritizing of racism as a central concern for social inquiry, when it comes to specifying what diaspora entails and how it works, vestiges of culture reemerge as a basis for the coherence of this new conceptual focus. When Gilroy delineates the elements and dimensions of diaspora, culture provides the basic conceptual background and terminology. In characterizing ‘‘the Atlantic diaspora and its successor-cultures,’’ Gilroy sequentially invokes ‘‘black cultural styles’’ and ‘‘postslave cultures’’ that have ‘‘supplied a platform for youth cultures, popular cultures, and styles of dissent far from their place of origin’’ (178). Gilroy explains how the ‘‘cultural expressions’’ of hip-hop and rap, along with other expressive forms of ‘‘black popular culture,’’ are marketed by the ‘‘cultural industries’’ to white consumers who ‘‘currently support this black culture’’ (181). Granted, in these uses of ‘‘culture’’ Gilroy remains critical of ‘‘absolutist definitions of culture’’ and the process of commodification that culture in turn supports. But his move away from race importantly hinges upon some notion of culture. We may be able to do away with race, but seemingly not with culture.

#### ( ) Rap and hip hop are tools to be exploited by corporations- images of rap as a platform just entrench racism

Kitiwana ‘2

[Bakari. Fellow at the Jamestown Project (Harvard) The Hip Hop Generation, 2002. Pg 9-11 Googlebooks]

Let us begin with popular culture and the visibility of Black youth within it. Today, more and more Black youth are turning to rap music, music videos, designer clothing, popular Black films, and television programs for values and identity. One can find the faces, bodies, attitudes, and language of Black youth attached to slick advertisements that sell what have become global products, whether it’s Coca-Cola and Pepsi, Reebok and Nike sneakers, films such as *Love Jones* and *Set it Off,* or popular rap artists like Missy Elliot and Busta Rhymes. Working diligently behind the scene and toward the bottom line are the multinational corporations that produce, distribute, and shape these images. That Black youth in New Orleans, Louisiana, and Champaign, Illinois, for example, share similar dress styles, colloquialisms, and body language with urban kids from Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York City is not coincidental. We live in an age where corporate mergers, particularly in media and entertainment, have redefined public space. Within this largely expanded public space, the viewing public is constantly bombarded by visual images that have become central to the identity of an entire generation. Within the arena of popular culture, rap music more than anything else has helped shape the new Black youth culture. From 1997 to 1998, rap music sales showed a 31 percent increase, making rap the fastest growing music genre, ahead of country, rock, classical, and all other musical forms. By 1998 rap was the top-selling musical format, outdistancing rock music and country music, the previous leading sellers. Rap music’s prominence on the American music scene was evident by the late 1990s- from its increasing presence at the Grammy’s (which in 1998, for example, awarded rapper Lauryn Hill five awards) to its pervasiveness in advertisements for mainstream corporation like AT&T, The Gap, Levi’s, and so on. Cultural critic Cornel West, in his prophetic *Race Matters* (Beacon Press, 1993), refers to this high level of visibility of young blacks, primarily professional athletes and entertainers, in American popular culture as the Afro-Americanization of white youth. The Afro-Americanization of white youth has been more a male than female affair given the prominence of male athletes and the cultural weight of male pop artists. This process results in white youth-male and female- imitating and emulating black male styles of walking, talking, dressing and gesticulating in relations to others. The irony in our present moment is that just as young black men are murdered, maimed, and imprisoned in record numbers, their styles have become disproportionately influential in shaping popular culture. Whereas previously the voices of young Blacks had been locked out of the global age’s public square, the mainstreaming of rap music now gave Black youth more visibility and a broader platform than we ever had enjoyed before. At the same time, it gave young Blacks across the country who identified with it and were informed by it a medium through which to share a national culture. In the process, rap artists became the dominant public voice of this generation. Many have been effective in bringing the generation’s issues to the fore. From NWA to Master P, rappers- through their lyrics, style, and attitude- helped to carve a new Black youth identity into the national landscape. Rappers’ access to global media and their use of popular culture to articulate many aspects of this national identity renders rap music central to any discussion of the new Black youth culture. The irony in all this is that the global corporate structure that gave young Blacks a platform was the driving force behind our plight.

#### ( ) More ev – hip hop just re-entrenches racism

Kitiwana ‘2

[Bakari. Fellow at the Jamestown Project (Harvard) The Hip Hop Generation, 2002. Pg intro Googlebooks]

A final obstacle is the unprecedented influence Black youth have achieved through popular culture, especially via the hip-hop phenomenon. Young Blacks have used this access, both in pop film and music, far too much to strengthen associations between Blackness and poverty, while celebrating anti-intellectualism, ignorance, irresponsible parenthood, and criminal lifestyles. This is the paradox: given hip-hop’s growing influence, these *Birth of a Nation-* styled representations receive a free pass from Black leaders and organizations seeking influence with the younger generation. These depictions also escape any real criticism from non-Black critics who, having grown tired of the race card, fear being attacked as racist. Void of open and consistent, criticism, such widely distributed incendiary ideas (what cultural critic Stanley Crouch calls “the new minstrelsy”) reinforce myths of Black inferiority and insulate the new problems in African American culture from redemptive criticism.

### AT//Pictures

#### ( ) They don’t meet our interpretation. Only our interpretation is based off the definition of the resolutional phrases – even if their interpretation is important, it’s not predictable and sets no limit on the topic. All that work was above – they don’t meet Resolved, Should, Substantial, or Federal Government – means they link to every piece of offense we’ve read.

#### ( ) Pictures generate the worst forms of advocacy

Fleming ‘96

(David, some kind of comm dude, Argumentation and Advocacy, Summer)

What O'Keefe (1977) calls "argument[1]" (a reason-giving speech act), then, is fully understandable only in the context of "argument[2]" (a social interaction characterized by disagreement). We provide reasons for our beliefs, Toulmin (1958,p. 97, pp. 214-216) wrote, because other people can always demand them from us. Similarly, Kuhn (1991,pp. 12-13) proposes that we consider "rhetorical argument" (an assertion with accompanying justification) as interiorized "dialogic argument" (the juxtaposition of opposing assertions). Habermas (1981/ 1984) also posits a close relation between reason-giving and social opposition. People advance reasons, Habermas says, in order to gain intersubjective recognition for "criticizable validity claims" (p. 17). The "rationality of an expression," then, is a function of "its being susceptible of criticism" (p. 9) To our earlier principle that an argument always contains two parts, claim and support, we can now add the related principle that an argument always occurs in a context of (implicit or explicit) disagreement, doubt, and opposition. Pictures seem to have difficulty satisfying the first requirement; can they satisfy the second? Our definition of a picture as a representation meant to "look like" the visible world turns out to have some bearing on this question. Because if the picture is perceived to be closer to the material world than language, then it may be less negatable as a communicative entity. Why? Because negation is a linguistic function, foreign to the concrete and analogic world of the non-verbal. As Burke (1966,p. 419) put it, "the negative is a peculiarly linguistic resource."[6] It is only with language, he writes, and particularly through the linguistic act of proscription, that the nonverbal is imbued with negative force. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969,p. 155) also restrict negation to discourse, although they are more explicit about its social origins. From this perspective, the pictorial has no negative. "Art," says Langer (1942,p. 214), "gives form to something that is simply there." Worth (1981,p. 173) is also clear on this point. The "ability of words to deal with what is not," he writes, "is one of the central functions of language"; the picture is incapable of this function[7] We can use language to indicate what a picture is not, but there is no pictorial way of doing this. An example may help here. A photograph in a college brochure showing a smiling student walking down a sidewalk on a sunny day can be an effective device for promoting the school to high school students and their parents. When they arrive on campus as freshmen, however, many of those students will discover that there aren't many sunny days in that part of the world (what's worse, there aren't many smiling people either). The picture is not necessarily deceptive; unless faked, it is a recording of an actual-albeit posed-event. What the picture cannot do, in other words, is provide viewers with access to its opposite, cannot by picturing a smiling student on a sunny day suggest non-sunny days and non-smiling students. We can't look at a picture and produce its pictorial opposite without first translating it into a negatable linguistic assertion. To pictorially "oppose" the picture, we would have to treat the original as somehow equivalent to or captioned by the relevant language which our new picture refutes. With words, on the other hand, there is always the possibility of negation; as Peirce (1991,p. 189) wrote, an "assertion always implies a denial of something else." When you say "It's hot out here," the statement is actually or potentially the opening volley for an infinite range of subsequent and easily-imagined or -produced opposing statements: "no, it's not, .... I think it's cold," etc.[8] Because language is, from this point of view, so distinct from the existential complex which it is apparently "about," any assertion pretending to "be" reality is-by its very difference from that reality-open to doubt, question, elaboration, criticism, testing, disagreement, endorsement, etc.[9] With pictures, however, what is shown just is. A picture, because it seems to have a closer material relationship with the represented world, is therefore less available for opposition than language. It resists opposition, improvement, and debate as much as it resists assertion. The point here is not that language is more responsible than pictures; only that it is difficult to access reliably with a picture any message other than the one being pictured. To doubt, question, or criticize that message, we would need to introduce language into the situation, an operation that can be especially difficult (and risky) if the initial message is not linguistically explicit. Now it is true that we can construct a visual sign reliably translated as a verbal proscription; but this, Worth (1981,p. 173) claims, is simply a linguistic use of a visual form (e.g., a drawing of a cigarette superimposed by a red diagonal line is merely a visual substitute for the verbal utterance "No smoking").

#### ( ) Their use of pictures link turns any reason why images and performance can be good—treating them as arguments collapses the distinctions that allow them to be studied in their own right

Fleming ‘96

(David, some kind of comm dude, Argumentation and Advocacy, Summer)

Others, however, have resisted the idea of non-linguistic argumentation. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), for example, maintain that the theory of argument should concern itself only with "the discursive means of obtaining the adherence of minds" (emphasis in original, p. 8). An action "designed to obtain adherence falls outside [italics added] the range of argumentation," they write, "to the degree that the use of language is lacking in its support or interpretation" (p. 8). Van Eemeren, Grootendorst and Kruiger (1984) also consider argumentation to be necessarily verbal: Argumentation requires the use of language. A person engaged in argumentation makes an assertion or statement, assumes or doubts something, denies something, and so on. For the performance of all these activities he [or she] must utter words and sentences (whether spoken or written). Besides these verbal means he can, of course-just as in any other verbal activity-employ non-verbal means (e.g., facial expression and gestures). To the extent that these fulfill an argumentative function, they can always be explicitized verbally. However, non-verbal means of communication can never completely replace verbal ones: argumentation without the use of language is impossible. This means that a person engaged in argumentation has deliberately opted for the use of verbal means. He clearly prefers to use words rather than non-verbal means of communication; he [or she] speaks, rather than resorting to blows or other forms of violence. Here we have another excellent reason for calling argumentation a pre-eminently verbal activity. The arguer uses words to lend force to his [or her] words. (p. 3) For Kneupper (1978), non-verbal signs may be used in argument, but they don't function as arguments unless linguistically translated. And Balthrop (1980,p. 185) claims that argument is "inherently discursive and linguistic." The notion that non-discursive or artistic forms can be arguments, he writes, "would preclude argument from fulfilling" its reason-giving or justificatory function (p. 188). Finally, Toulmin, Rieke and Janik (1979,p. 137) write that "reasoning could not exist in the absence of language. Both claims and all the considerations used to support them must be expressed by some kind of a linguistic symbol system."[2] Let's try out a fairly conventional definition and see how pictures stack up. An argument is an intentional human act in which support is offered on behalf of a debatable belief. It is characterized first and foremost by reasonableness. Now, to say that an act or object is "reasonable" is, first, to assert that reasons can be adduced in order to make that act or object acceptable to some audience (what is acceptable is, of course, local and indeterminate, but the act of adducing reasons to make something acceptable is, I believe, cross-situational). An argument, in other words, involves a two-part relation, one part (evidence, data, proof, support, reason, etc.) supporting the other (position, claim, assertion, conclusion, thesis, point, argument, proposition, etc.). Second, to say that something is "reasonable" is to assert that it admits of improvement, is corrigible, refutable, accountable; it is an act or object which can be interrogated, criticized, and elaborated by others (and even invites interrogation, criticism, and elaboration). An argument exists, that is, in a specifiable context of debate, controversy, opposition, or doubt; its position is thus necessarily contestable. Now, whatever else a picture can do, it cannot satisfy these two criteria. First, it lacks the requisite internal differentiation; it is impossible to reliably distinguish in a picture what is position, and what is evidence for that position. The distinction at the heart of argument, the difference between that which asserts and that which supports, is thus collapsed. Second, a picture cannot with reliability be refuted, opposed, or negated. It can be countered but only by introducing words into the situation; the picture itself makes no claim which can be contested, doubted, or otherwise improved upon by others. If I oppose the "position" you articulate in a picture, you can simply deny that your picture ever articulated that, or any other, position. The picture is only refutable if first translated into language-in which case we have left the realm of pictures altogether. Now, we can ignore these problems and call pictures "arguments" anyway. But to do so would, I believe, deprive the term of its significance. Because if a picture can (self-sufficiently) be an "argument," then what do we call the linguistic act of asserting and supporting debatable claims? To say that a picture can be an argument is to leave individuals with the impression that they have argued for something when they have merely placed it in someone else's field of vision. Further, to claim that a picture can be an argument is to make it less likely that analysts will attend to the rhetorical functions that pictures can and do serve.

#### ( ) We have an independent impact—mixing aesthetic concerns with political argument encourages mass murder—totalitarian violence will remain unchecked

Teachout ‘3

(Terry, Commentary music critic and the drama critic of the Wall Street Journal, Commentary, September 2003, proquest)

Hitler, in short, was a deranged idealist, a painter who sought power over others in order to make his romantic dreams real, then grew ever more bloodthirsty when the human beings who were his flesh-and-blood medium resisted his transforming touch. He was not the first such murderous artist. As Irving Babbitt wrote of the similarly mad idealists who had unleashed their own reign of terror on France: Robespierre and Saint-Just were ready to eliminate violendy whole social strata that seemed to them to be made up of parasites and conspirators, in order that they might adjust this actual France to the Sparta of their dreams; so that the Terror was far more than is commonly realized a bucolic episode. It lends color to the assertion that has been made that the last stage of sentimentalism is homicidal mania. To READ Hitler and the Power of Aesthetics is to reflect not only on power but on the various ways in which artists through the ages have responded to power, and more specifically to the politicians and political ideas of their time. In Nazi Germany, this response, as Frederic Spotts reminds us, was overwhelmingly positive. The list of distinguished non-Jewish artists who left the country after Hitler came to power is brief to the point of invisibility when placed next to the rogues' gallery of those who stayed behind, in many cases not merely accepting the inevitability of Nazi rule but actively collaborating with the regime. The composers Carl Orff and Richard Strauss, the conductors Wilhelm Furtwangler and Herbert von Karajan, the Nobel Prize-winning author Gerhart Hauptmann, the filmmaker Leni Riefenstahl, the actor Emil Jannings, the stage designer Caspar Neher-all these and many more were perfectly prepared to make their peace with Nazism. What drove these men and women? No doubt, in some cases, the motive was the crudest sort of self-interest. For not only did Hitler subsidize the arts, he subsidized individual artists as well, in many cases lavishly. And even those who were not the direct objects of his personal largesse benefited from his open-handed arts policy, which included exemption from military service, as well as from the fact that the emigration and slaughter of prominent Jewish artists left more room at the top of the heap. In addition, many German artists were true Nazi believers; ironically, their number included a few, like the twelve-tone composer Anton Webern and the Expressionist painter Emil Nolde, whose modernist art was anathema to the Nazis. Others, whatever their reservations about specific policies, shared Hitler's loathing for modernism and endorsed his vision of Germany as the savior of the West. The relationship of these artists to the Nazi regime remains relevant to mis day. Though artists vary widely in their political awareness-from total indifference on the one hand to passionate involvement on the other-many, perhaps most, find it hard to resist the blandishments of politicians who appear to take an informed interest, however specious, in the arts. Shelley's famous assertion that "poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world" can also be read as a rueful admission that the world deigns at any given moment to acknowledge only a handful of serious artists. The rest are regarded with comparative indifference, especially in market-based democracies where no natural mechanism exists to introduce the "masses" to high art. Some artists accept their comparatively lowly status, finding sufficient reward in the practice of their calling. But others are enraged by it, particularly those romantics who long to remake the world so as to bring it into closer accord with their private visions. Such artists are irresistibly drawn to men of power, and are sometimes willing to pervert their art in the name of politics. Hitler, both a romantic and an artist manque, understood this temptation and made the most of it. The historian Paul Johnson understands it as well, and has it in mind when he writes: "Art, no less than politics, carries with it a whiff of sulphur, the stench of the charnel-house." It is tempting to try to excuse this as mere foolishness. As Hitler himself once remarked, "Artists are simple-hearted souls. Today they sign this, tomorrow that; they don't even look to see what it is, so long as it seems to them well-meaning." But as he knew-better, perhaps, than any other politician of the 20th century-ideas have consequences, and the artist who succumbs to the temptation to dabble in ill-digested political ideas, be he a Nazi, a Communist, or a pacifist, is as morally responsible for their ultimate consequences as any other human being. In the end, beauty excuses nothing, least of all mass murder.

#### ( ) Pictures can’t be arguments

Fleming ‘96

(David, some kind of comm dude, Argumentation and Advocacy, Summer)

To sum up, argument is reasoning towards a debatable conclusion. It is a human act conducted in two parts (claim and support) and with awareness of two sides (the claim allows for and even invites opposition). By this definition, something which cannot be broken down into claim and support, and whose claim is not reliably contestable, is not an argument, whatever else it may be and however else it may participate in argument. It would seem, then, that a picture can be considered an "argument" only by stretching the meaning of that word beyond recognition. Its lack of internal differentiation between claim and support precludes it from serving as a self-sufficient argument. And its non-refutability precludes it from acting as an argumentative claim without language because it is unable to assert a contestable position. To be refutable, the picture would have to be translated into a linguistic statement, in which case either the visual is irrelevant (since now duplicated by language), or the verbal is such a reduction of the visual as to be an entirely new thought altogether. This last possibility, in which the non-argumentative artifact is translated into one, appears to be what Fisher and Filloy (1982) mean when they claim that fictional and dramatic works are "arguments." When they translate The Great Gatsby, what they end up with is clearly argumentative; but it is no longer The Great Gatsby.

### AT//Science Fiction

#### ( ) Science fiction’s alienating – results in bad policy and cedes the political – the impact is our pragmatism argument

Lepgold and Nincic ‘1

(Joesph, associate professor of Government at Georgetown and Miroslav professor of Poly Sci at UC-Davis, Beyond the Ivory Tower: International Relations Theory and the Issue of Policy Relevance pg. 6-7) (SIR = Scholastic International Relations, the term for thinkers who discuss the theory behind real world processes)

Unlike literature, pure mathematics, or formal logic, the study of inter- national relations may be valued largely for its practical implications and insights. SIR, like the major social-science disciplines, initially gained a firm foundation in academia on the assumption that it contributes to improved policy.9 It is part of what August Comte believed would constitute a new, “positive” science of society, one that would supersede the older tradition of metaphysical speculation about humanity and the social world. Progress toward this end has been incomplete as well as uneven across the social sciences. But, in virtually all of these fields, it has been driven by more than just curiosity as an end in itself. Tightening our grip on key social processes via improved understanding has always been a major incentive for new knowledge in the social sciences, especially in the study of international relations. This broad purpose covers a lot of specific ground. Policymakers want to know what range of effective choice they have, the likely international and domestic consequences of various policy decisions, and perhaps whether, in terms of more general interests and values, contemplated policy objectives are really desirable, should they be achievable. But the practical implications of international issues hardly end there. How wars start and end, the causes and implications of economic interdependence, and what leverage individ- ual states might have on trans-state problems greatly affects ordinary citizens’ physical safety, prosperity, and collective identity. Today, it is hard to think of any major public-policy issue that is not affected by a state’s or society’s relationships with other international actors. Because the United States looms so large within the international system, its citizens are sometimes unaware of the range and impact of international events and processes on their condition. It may take an experience such as the long gas lines in the 1970s or the foreign-inspired terrorist bombings in the 1990s to remind them how powerfully the outside world now impinges upon them. As Karl Deutsch observed, even the smallest states can no longer effectively isolate themselves, and even the largest ones face limits on their ability to change others’ behavior or values.11 In a broad sense, globalization The Theory-Practice Gap in International Relations means that events in many places will affect people’s investment opportu- nities, the value of their money, whether they feel that their values are safe or under attack, and perhaps whether they will be safe from attack by weap- ons of mass destruction or terrorism. These points can be illustrated by observing university undergraduates, who constitute one of the broadest categories of people who are potentially curious about IR. Unlike doctoral students, they care much less about po- litical science than about the substance of politics. What they seem to un- derstand is that the subject matter of SIR, regardless of the level of theoretical abstraction at which it is discussed, inherently has practical implications.

### AT//Anthropocentric Views of the Topic

#### ( ) Abandonment of humanist values leaves us unable to act to stop atrocities and threatens the survival of the universe.

Ketels ‘96

[Violet. Associate Professor of English at Temple University, “‘Havel to the Castle!’ The Power of the Word,” 548 Annals 45, November, Sage]

The political bestiality of our age is abetted by our willingness to tolerate the deconstructing of humanist values. The process begins with the cynical manipulation of language. It often ends in stupefying murderousness before which the world stands silent, frozen in impotent "attentism"—a wait-and-see stance as unsuited to the human plight as a pacifier is to stopping up the hunger of a starving child. We have let lapse our pledge to the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holocaust that their deaths might somehow be transfiguring for humankind. We allow "slaughterhouse men" tactical status at U.N. tables and "cast down our eyes when the depraved roar past."1 Peacemakers, delegated by us and circumscribed by our fears, temporize with thugs who have revived lebensraum claims more boldly than Hitler did. In the Germany of the 1930s, a demonic idea was born in a demented brain; the word went forth; orders were given, repeated, widely broadcast; and men, women, and children were herded into death camps. Their offshore signals, cries for help, did not summon us to rescue. We had become inured to the reality of human suffering. We could no longer hear what the words meant or did not credit them or not enough of us joined the chorus. Shrieking victims perished in the cold blankness of inhumane silence. We were deaf to the apocalyptic urgency in Solzhenitsyn's declaration from the Gulag that we must check the disastrous course of history. We were heedless of the lesson of his experience that only the unbending strength of the human spirit, fully taking its stand on the shifting frontier of encroaching violence and declaring "not one step further," though death may be the end of it—only this unwavering firmness offers any genuine defense of peace for the individual, of genuine peace for mankind at large.2 In past human crises, writers and thinkers strained language to the breaking point to keep alive the memory of the unimaginable, to keep the human conscience from forgetting. In the current context, however, intellectuals seem more devoted to abstract assaults on values than to thoughtful probing of the moral dimensions of human experience. "Heirs of the ancient possessions of higher knowledge and literacy skills,"3 we seem to have lost our nerve, and not only because of Holocaust history and its tragic aftermath. We feel insecure before the empirical absolutes of hard science. We are intimidated by the "high modernist rage against mimesis and content,"\* monstrous progeny of the union between Nietzsche and philosophical formalism, the grim proposal we have bought into that there is no truth, no objectivity, and no disinterested knowledge.5 Less certain about the power of language, that "oldest flame of the humanist soul,"6 to frame a credo to live by or criteria to judge by, we are vulnerable even to the discredited Paul de Man's indecent hint that "wars and revolutions are not empirical events . . . but 'texts' masquerading as facts."7 Truth and reality seem more elusive than they ever were in the past; values are pronounced to be mere fictions of ruling elites to retain power. We are embarrassed by virtue. Words collide and crack under these new skeptical strains, dissolving into banalities the colossal enormity of what must be expressed lest we forget. Remembering for the future has become doubly dispiriting by our having to remember for the present, too, our having to register and confront what is wrong here and now. The reality to be fixed in memory shifts as we seek words for it; the memory we set down is flawed by our subjectivities. It is selective, deceptive, partial, unreliable, and amoral. It plays tricks and can be invented. It stops up its ears to shut out what it does not dare to face.8 Lodged in our brains, such axioms, certified by science and statistics, tempt us to concede the final irrelevance of words and memory. We have to get on with our lives. Besides, memories reconstructed in words, even when they are documented by evidence, have not often changed the world or fended off the powerful seductions to silence, forgetting, or denying. Especially denying, which, in the case of the Holocaust, has become an obscene industry competing in the open market of ideas for control of our sense of the past. It is said that the Holocaust never happened. Revisionist history with a vengeance is purveyed in words; something in words must be set against it. Yet what? How do we nerve to the task when we are increasingly disposed to cast both words and memory in a condition of cryogenic dubiety? Not only before but also since 1945, the criminality of governments, paraded as politics and fattening on linguistic manipulation and deliberately reimplanted memory of past real or imagined grievance, has spread calamity across the planet. The cancer that has eaten at the entrails of Yugoslavia since Tito's death [hasj Kosovo for its locus," but not merely as a piece of land. The country's rogue adventurers use the word "Kosovo" to reinvokc as sacred the land where Serbs were defeated by Turks in 1389!9 Memory of bloody massacres in 1389, sloganized and distorted in 1989, demands the bloody revenge of new massacres and returns civilization not to its past glory but to its gory tribal wars. As Matija Beckovic, the bard of Serb nationalism, writes, "It is as if the Serbian people waged only one battle—by widening the Kosovo charnel-house, by adding wailing upon wailing, by counting new martyrs to the martyrs of Kosovo.... Kosovo is the Serbian-ized history of the Flood—the Serbian New Testament."10 A cover of Siiddeutsche Zeitung in 1994 was printed with blood donated by refugee women from Bosnia in an eerily perverse afterbirth of violence revisited." We stand benumbed before multiplying horrors. As Vaclav Havel warned more than a decade ago, regimes that generate them "are the avant garde of a global crisis in civilization." The depersonalization of power in "system, ideology and appa-rat," pathological suspicions about human motives and meanings, the loosening of individual responsibility, the swiftness by which disastrous events follow one upon another "have deprived us of our conscience, of our common sense and natural speech and thereby, of our actual humanity."12 Nothing less than the transformation of human consciousness is likely to rescue us.

#### ( ) Aff doesn’t solve—and if it does its worse for non-humans

Machan ‘4

(Tibor, Distinguished Fellow and Prof. @ Leatherby Center for Entrepreneurship & Business Ethics @ Chapman U., “Putting Humans First: Why We Are Nature’s Favorite”, p. 11-13)

Now, one can dispute Hospers, but only by averting one's gaze from the facts. If animals in fact did have rights as you and I understand the concept of rights—rights that entail and mandate a hands-off policy toward other rights possessors—most of the creatures now lurking in lawns and jungles, at the very least all the carnivores, would have to be brought up on murder charges. This is what all the animal rights champions fail to heed, including Ingrid Newkirk, radical leader of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), who holds that it is unacceptable for us to use animals in any way at all.13 This is why they allow themselves such vile thoughts as that "the world would be an infinitely better place without humans in it at all."'4 If the scenario is absurd, it's so not because the concept of animal rights has been unfairly reduced to absurdity but because there is nowhere else to go. The idea of animal rights is impracticable to begin with; any attempt to visualize the denizens of the animal world benefiting from and respecting rights must collapse into fantasy willy-nilly. ¶ The concept of rights emerged with the rise of human civilization precisely because it is needed by and applicable to human beings, given the specifically moral nature of human beings and their ambition to live with each other in mutual harmony and to mutual benefit. Rights have nothing to do with the lives of wolves and turtles because of what animal rights champions themselves admit, namely, the amoral nature of at least the bulk of the animal world.15 Advocates of animal rights in at least one way do admit the vast gulf between animals and humans and that humans alone are equipped to deal with moral issues. When they address us alone about these matters—when they accept all the carnage that is perpetrated by other living things, including what would be infanticide and worse if human beings were to engage in it—they clearly imply that human beings are indeed special. They imply, first and foremost, that people are indeed the only living beings capable of understanding a moral appeal. Only human beings can be implored to do right rather than wrong. Other animals just don't have the capacity for this. And so the environmentalists don't confront them with any moral arguments no matter how politically incorrect the animals may be toward one another.

#### ( ) Representing human impacts is a necessary part of environmental ethics and consistent with your argument

Plumwood ‘2

(Val, PF PHILOSOPHY - UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, Environmental Culture: The ecological crisis of reason, PG. 138-40]

Recognition, prudence and survival But by providing reasons for considering nature based on human prudence, are we not perpetuating the verv human-centredness and instrumentalism we should seek to combat, considering nature only in relation to our own needs and as means to meet those needs? This issue reveals another major area of difference between the cosmic model implying elimination of human bearings and the liberation model of human-cent redness of the sort I have given. Only in the confused account of anthropocentrismas cosmic anthropocentrism is it essential to avoid anything which smacks of human bearings and preferences in the interests of pursuing superhuman detachment. On the liberation account of human-centred ness, there is no problem or inconsistency in introducing some prudential considerations to motivate change, or to show why, for example, human-centredness is not benign and must lead to damaging consequences for humankind. To gain a better understanding of the role of prudence in the kinds of changes that might be required, let us return to the marital example of Bruce and Ann. Let us suppose that instead of leaving right away, Ann persuades Bruce to try a visit to a marriage counsellor to see if Bruce can change enough to save their relationship. (We will have to assume that Bruce has some redeeming features I have not described here to explain why Ann considers it worthwhile going to all this trouble). After listening to their stories, the counsellor diagnoses Bruce as a textbook case of egocentrism, an individual version of the centredness structure set out above. Bruce seems to view his interests as somehow radically separate from Ann's, so that he is prepared to act on her request for more consideration only if she can show he will get more pleasure if he does so, that is, for instrumental reasons which appeal to a self-contained conception of his interests. He seems to see Ann in instrumental terms not as an independent person but as someone defined in tenus of his own needs, and claims it is her problem if she is dissatistied or miserable. Bruce sees Ann as there to service his needs, lacks sensitivity to her needs and does not respect her independence or agency. 24 Bruce, let us suppose, also devalues the importance of the relationship, denies his real dependency on Ann, backgrounds her services and contribution to his lite, and seems to be completely unaware of the extent to which he might suffer when the relationship he is abusing breaks down. Bruce, despite Ann's warnings, does not imagine that it will, and is sure that it will all blow over: after a few tears and tantrums Ann will come to her senses, as she has always done before, according to Bruce. Now the counsellor, June, takes on the task of pointing out to Bruce that his continued self-centredness and instrumental treatment of Ann is likely to lead in short order to the breakdown and loss of his relationship. The counsellor tries to show Bruce that he has underestimated both Ann's determination to leave unless there is change, as well as the sustaining character of the relationship. June points out that he may, like many similar people the counsellor has seen, sutler much more severe emotional stress than he realises when Ann leaves, as she surely will unless Bruce changes. Notice that June's initial appeal to Bruce is a prudential one; June tries to point out to Bruce that he has misconceived the relationship and to make him understand where his real interests lie. There is no inconsistency here; the counsellor can point out these damaging consequences of instrumental relationship for Bruce without in any way using, endorsing or encouraging instrumental relationships. In the same way, the critic of human-centredness can say with perfect consistency, to a society trapped in the centric logic ofthe One and the Other in relation to nature, that unless it is willing to give enough consideration to nature's needs, it too could lose a relationship whose importance it has failed to understand, has systematically devalued and denied - with, perhaps, more serious consequences for survival than in Bruce's case. The account of human-centredness I have given, then, unlike the cosmic account demanding self-transcendence and self-detachment, does not prohibit the use of certain forms of prudential ecological argument, although it does suggest certain contexts and qualifications for their use. In the case of Ann and Bruce, June the counsellor might particularly advance these prudential reasons as the main reasons for treating Ann with more care and respect at the initial stages of the task of convincing Bruce of the need for change. Prudential arguments need not just concern the danger of losing the relationship. June may also try to show Bruce how the structure of egocentrism distorts and limits his character and cuts him off from the main benefits of a caring relationship, such as the sense of the limitations ofth~ self and its perspectives obtained by an intimate encounter with someone else's needs and reality. Prddential arguments of all kinds for respect are the kinds of arguments that are especially useful in an initial context of denial, while there is still no realisation of that there is a serious problem, and resistance to the idea of undertaking work for change. In the same way, the appeal to prudential considerations of ecological damage to humans is especially appropriate in the initial context of ecological denial. where there is still no systematic acknowledgement of human attitudes as a problem, and resistance to the idea of undertaking substantial social change. Although reasons of advantage or disadvantage to the self cannot be the only kinds of considerations in a framework which exhibits genuine respect for the other, the needs of the self do not have to be excluded at any stage from this process, as the fallacious view of prudence as always instrumental and egocentric suggests.

### AT//Metaphors

#### ( ) Metaphor risks oversimplification and miscommunication, even if the metaphor itself is correct

Hart ‘6

(Hart, Geoff, September 2006, “Editorial: Overextending metaphors”, Scientific Communication, Vol. 13 No. 1, http://www.stcsig.org/sc/newsletter/html/2006-3.htm)

One problem with metaphors is that they can be carried too far: because a metaphor is only a simulation of reality, it does not precisely or fully match that reality, and each mismatch can potentially lead to misunderstanding. Consider, for example, the trash can used to delete files in most graphical user interfaces. The Macintosh interface designers who chose this metaphor to describe how users discard files chose an obvious and effective metaphor because just about everyone understands how a trash can works. But unfortunately, a great many users took that metaphor places its designers never intended. When this interface choice was first made, many Macintosh owners used their computer at home or in a small graphics studio rather than in a large corporate workplace, and thus used their experience with trash cans to make the following assumption: "When I throw something in the trash, it's going to stay there forever, or at least until I can persuade someone to take out the trash." Unfortunately, the first implementation of the Macintosh trash can automatically emptied the trash when you shut down your computer. That was clearly a problem for anyone who expected the discarded files to still be there waiting for them the next day when they turned on their computer. So many people complained about losing precious files (never mind that these files should never have been in the trash in the first place) that Apple changed the interface. Version two of the trash can accounted for this problem by leaving deleted files in the trash until someone specifically told the computer to empty the trash. That's a great idea, except by then, the world had moved on and more Macintosh users were using their computer in the workplace, where a janitor could be relied on to empty the trash each night after the workers went home. Since that wasn’t the way the software actually worked, the inevitable consequence was that files accumulated in the trash until they took over the entire computer; in other cases, people deleted files that were potentially embarrassing, not realizing the files were still there to be discovered by anyone who went poking around in the trash. Clearly, another small interface failure; unlike a spouse or roommate, the Macintosh operating system doesn't remind you to empty your trash periodically. A future iteration of the interface will presumably strike the right balance between versions one and two by retaining information in the trash until you specifically delete it, but also by periodically providing a gentle reminder to empty the trash. This example illustrates an important rule for successful use of metaphors: you must strive to understand the consequences of the metaphor by asking yourself what users will think when they encounter it, and thus, how they can be expected to behave. Where some behaviors will prove damaging, we need to clearly communicate the problem and its solution in our documentation. Better still, we need to report the problem to the designers of a product so they can take appropriate measures to protect users from their own instincts. Another significant problem with metaphors is that they rely on certain assumptions, and those assumptions bias how we think about reality. One of the most famous (some might say infamous) relates to a favorite device of science fiction writers: time travel. Science fiction writer René Barjavel, in pondering the implications of time travel, wondered about what quickly became known as the grandfather paradox: What would happen if you traveled back in time to a date before your parents were born, and killed one of your grandparents? Clearly, this means that one of your parents would never have lived, and thus could not have conceived you; the result, a few years into the future, is that you would never exist to return and kill that grandparent. But because you did not kill the grandparent, your parent would be born, leading to your birth and your subsequent desire to travel back in time and become a murderer. Round and round we go until we give up in frustration and choose a convenient way to avoid the problem—declare that time travel is impossible. Whether or not time travel really is impossible, that would be an unfortunate choice, because paradoxes are crucially important in science: they reveal when we don't understand a process nearly as clearly as we thought we did. If we did understand fully, there would be no paradox. The grandfather paradox presupposes that we understand how the physics of time travel would really work, namely that there is an indestructible connection between the past and the future and that changing the past would inevitably change the future. Should we stop there, no one would ever examine time travel in more detail to see whether other possibilities exist, and that would rob us of a much richer understanding of our world. One consequence might be the elimination of the branch of mathematics that examines the "many worlds" hypothesis, in which a whole new universe is hypothesized to spring into existence as soon as we change the past. In the case of the grandfather paradox, this means that two universes (one in which you are born and one in which you are not) would move forward through time from that point onwards. In writing a story, I once proposed a different metaphor: that time is more like a VHS tape, and that if you go back and change something, this is no different from recording over an old program you've already watched. The future (the part of the tape after the new recording) isn't changed because you haven't overwritten it yet. Both metaphors may be entirely incorrect (as seems likely based on our modern understanding of physics), but their correctness is not the important issue here: what's important is how each metaphor biases the way we think and predetermines the kind of analysis we're prepared to consider. Thus, a second rule of successful use of metaphors is that we must take great pains to understand the constraints they place on our thoughts. If we're aware of those constraints, we can attempt to work around them; if not, we won't make that effort, and that may prevent us from making crucial new discoveries. A third problem arises if we oversimplify our description of reality and thus neglect key issues. Consider, for example, the issue of fighting forest fires. Because mature forests develop over time spans longer than the typical human life, it's natural for us to think of them as eternal. Because we now understand the value of "untouched" nature, the inevitable consequence is that we want to preserve old forests and protect them against fires. This belief is epitomized in the public consciousness by Smokey the Bear and the "only you can prevent forest fires" slogan. Although it's true that human-originated fires are a serious problem, and should often be fought, the often part is neglected. In particular, the limited worldview offered by Smokey the Bear ignores the fact that fires are a crucial part of natural ecosystems and that some forest ecosystems only develop after fires, and will eventually disappear from the landscape if natural fires are not allowed to burn. The more general point is captured by the cliché that "the only constant is change". Ecosystems, including forests, aren't truly stable; instead, they exhibit what is known as metastability, in which what seems stable from the outside is actually changing continuously. In a forest, old trees die, unlucky trees are felled by lightning or windstorms, and new trees sprout to take their place. Rather than perfect stability, a mature forest is in equilibrium: individual components change, but the overall ecosystem stays close to its current state. Yet these equilibrium states also change; if the environment changes, or if disturbances such as fire are prevented, natural processes will lead the ecosystem to change into something new, and a new equilibrium will develop. For example, in the absence of fire, boreal jack pine forests will be replaced by shade-tolerant decidous trees that grow in the limited light beneath the forest canopy. As the older trees die, they are replaced by younger decidous trees, which produce so much shade when mature that the pines can no longer survive. The problem with describing ecosystems as stable is that it conceals the important concept of dynamic equilibrium, and the consequence that any equilibrium will eventually shift to a new type of equilibrium. This means we can never preserve a specific ecosystem in its current state forever, and that we probably should not try. Instead, it is more important to preserve the conditions that allow a given site to evolve naturally from one equilibrium state to another ("succession"), while altering conditions elsewhere to permit the development of the desired ecosystem. Communicating more of the complexity provides the necessary bounds on the metaphor, permits a more complete understanding, and lets us choose wiser management strategies. A third rule for successful use of metaphors is thus that we must identify critical points of failure—places where the metaphor is insufficiently complete that it leads our audience astray—and must provide the missing complexity that will prevent this misunderstanding. We must recognize that the purpose of a metaphor is to facilitate understanding, but once that understanding exists, we must build on it to provide any missing details that explain the true complexity. As scientific communicators, we often resort to metaphors because of their power to facilitate understanding. But to use metaphors successfully, we must be conscious of the problems I've identified in this essay: we must identify mismatches with reality, implicit and explicit assumptions, and places where the metaphor is too simplistic. Understanding these three problems lets us help our audience to understand the mismatches between the metaphor and reality, remind them of the assumptions behind the metaphor so that they can challenge those assumptions and make conceptual breakthroughs, and recognize where we have oversimplified a complex reality. That oversimplification is only acceptable if it provides an initial understanding that we can subsequently build upon to create a deeper, richer understanding.

### AT//Irony

#### ( ) Irony results in confusion and nihilism that recreates the oppression the aff seeks to resolve

Quinlan and Frank ‘5

(Adriane and Hannah, Yale Daily News, 11-11-05)

"The true mark of hipsterdom is … treating everything with the same tongue-in-cheek attitude," she went on. "The definition of irony, however, seems to get more and more blurry (is being ironic part of being a hipster, or is being a hipster ironic?)." Norman Mailer said as much half a century ago in his essay on hipsterhood, "The White Negro: Superficial Reflections on the Hipster." Mailer classifies this elusive/allusive figure as a "philosophical psychopath," one who is antithetical in his very being: He takes his irony very seriously and couches his depreciatory rhetoric in the language of joshing. It is impossible to discern who he really is underneath all of those defensive layers. This is to say that the praxis of hipsterhood is also that of denial: denial of other hipsters, denial of the unhip, as well as denial of one's own hipness. As such, the hipster condition, theoretical and practical, is best emblemized by that which it denies -- that which is specifically not hip at all. Belle & Sebastian, a Scottish band known for cutesy songs which you can cry along to, for instance, wasn't, isn't, and never will be hip: their adorable melancholy, the dolorous-fey disjunction junction that's seen also in clowns with tear-drenched face paint and in post-ecstatic candy ravers, precludes them from hipsterhood. Still, there is something to be said for the twee ditty, "I Don't Love Anyone," the nihilism of which borders on self-indulgence, whereby the loving of nothing resembles, albeit strangely, the adoration of oneself alone. In other words, the hipster is the quintessential know-it-all, "know" in the familiar sense, "know" in the Biblical sense and, as stated above, "know" in its homophonic sense, i.e., "no-it-all." She has seen everything there is to see, heard everything there is to hear, and what results is a tired, apathetic, been-there-done-that attitude, in which everything is a bore, not worth experiencing. The narrator of "I Don't Love Anyone" would have you believe he doesn't love anyone, meaning, of course, no one is good enough for him. But he gives himself away, namedropping, "The World is as Soft as Lace," a song by Felt, a British band from the mid-80s, the lyrics of which read, "I will not believe until it's mine / Until it's mine / All mine," thereby declaring his imperialistic hyperbole, this irrepressible need to colonize all that came before him so that all who follow him will, in turn, follow his will. But those who follow his will are readily misled, for to be a hipster is not only not to love, but also not to try. It is to appropriate and acquire, but not to give anything back. Reiterating the zero-sum game on which a hipster's hedonism is predicated, Marcuse wrote, "[T]he 'state of nature,' no matter how refined, prevails: A civilized bellum omnium contra omnes, in which the happiness of the ones must coexist with the suffering of the others." He speaks to the broader consumer-capitalist culture of which the hipster-paradigm is of course a part, but the dialectic -- between the haves and the have-nots -- plays itself out on the microcosm, as well. The unhip are the have-nots, while the hipsters are the haves. They have everything -- taste, style and cultural cache -- and they have done everything.

#### ( ) Turns the whole case – role confusion means your project achieves exactly nothing

Quinlan and Frank ‘5

(Adriane and Hannah, Yale Daily News, 11-11-05)

"The danger in being a hipster is looking and acting like a douche bag," Khong said. "The danger in being a hipster is winding up useless and wearing sunglasses after dark. The argument that it's dangerous for you to listen to what you like and what your friends like and what Pitchfork likes just seems petty … Why would anyone listen to music they didn't like anyway? … There's nothing fake about loving a band or a record, regardless of where you heard it first." Still, Pitchfork sells its starred reviews as the sanctified products of cool -- the stepping stones to manufactured hipness. In "The Conquest of Cool" (1998), Thomas Frank argues that what we find liberating, rebellious or "hip" is inextricable from the fabric of consumer culture. Nowadays "peace symbols decorate a line of cigarettes manufactured by R. J. Reynolds and the walls and windows of Starbucks coffee shops nationwide; the products of Apple, IBM and Microsoft are touted as devices of liberation; and advertising across the product category spectrum calls upon consumers to break rules and find themselves." Hipsters, it seems, find their true selves by declaring everything untrue: The proto-hipster is James Dean's "Rebel without a Cause" or Holden Caulfield, who describes the world as full of phonies, a cute hyperbole co-opted by livejournalists the world over, and Frank himself. "The relics of the counterculture reek of affectation and phoniness, the leisure-dreams of white suburban children," Frank wrote. Ultimately, the progeny of the "white suburban children" Frank described matriculate at the world's Princetons, Harvards and Yales, where they situate themselves squarely as squares. William Deresiewicz, a professor in Yale's English department, remarked, "I joke with my friends that 40 percent of Yale students are girls with pulled-back dirty blonde hair who wear halter tops when it's hot and sweatshirts when it's cold. And 40 percent are their boyfriends." The unsaid 20 percent might be called "hip" by the sweatshirt-wearers, but they strut their stuff in blazers and cardigans, the dress code of the establishment. As much was pointed out in a 2001 Atlantic Monthly article, "The Organization Kid," in which author David Brooks glowered at the present generation of workaholic students at Princeton, an Ivy League school where he found no counterculture. "[Today's college students] grew up in a world in which the counterculture and the mainstream culture have merged with, and co-opted, each other," Brooks wrote. "For them, it's natural that one of the top administrators at Princeton has a poster of the Beatles album 'Revolver' framed on her office wall." In other words, "the hip" is now "the Man." Perhaps Brooks found this to be the most conservative generation because its counterculture -- its "hipsters" -- claims not to love anything, chooses instead to reward apathy and thereby seeks not at all to change the world except through selective appropriation.

### AT//Roleplaying Bad

#### Roleplaying is good: The skills we learn in this activity are used to mediate conflicts in our daily lives. Those skills are in play right now which answers their link arguments about not participating in politics in the present. All of their link arguments are guilty of a form/content error. The content of debate does not undermine the benefits of the form that teaches us valuable nonviolence skills as well as providing us with a forum to engage personally with others.

#### ( ) Even if roleplaying’s bad, our offense is still applicable – to vote negative is to lobby the United States federal government to reject the plan. Using the contest round to *learn* about government policy ensures better activism skills, regardless of the sphere in which we use them.

#### ( ) They will say our framework produces observers instead of participants—we’ll impact turn this.

Coverstone ‘95

[Alan. Former Debater @ Wake, Former Debate Coach at Montgomery Bell Academy. “An Inward Glance” 1995. groups.wfu.edu/debate]

Mitchell's reflections are necessarily more accurate in his own situation. Over a decade of debate has well positioned him to participate actively and directly in the political process. Yet the skills he has did not develop overnight. Proper training requires time. While there is a tremendous variation in the amount of training required for effective navigation of the public sphere, the relative isolation of academic debate is one of its virtues. Instead of turning students of debate immediately outward, we should be encouraging more to enter the oasis. A thirsty public, drunk on the product of anyone who claims a decision, needs to drink from the pool of decision-making skills. Teaching these skills is our virtue.

#### ( ) Policy simulation key to creativity and decisionmaking—the detachment that they criticize is key to its revolutionary benefits

Eijkman ‘12

[Henk. Prof Academic Development at Annasaheb Dange College of Engineering (India). “The Role of Simulations in the Authentic Learning for National Security Policy Development: Implications for Practice” 2012, <http://nsc.anu.edu.au/test/documents/Sims_in_authentic_learning_report.pdf> ]

Policy simulations stimulate Creativity Participation in policy games has proved to be a highly effective way of developing new combinations of experience and creativity, which is precisely what innovation requires (Geurts et al. 2007: 548). Gaming, whether in analog or digital mode, has the power to stimulate creativity, and is one of the most engaging and liberating ways for making group work productive, challenging and enjoyable. Geurts et al. (2007) cite one instance where, in a National Health Care policy change environment, ‘the many parties involved accepted the invitation to participate in what was a revolutionary and politically very sensitive experiment precisely because it was a game’ (Geurts et al. 2007: 547). Data from other policy simulations also indicate the uncovering of issues of which participants were not aware, the emergence of new ideas not anticipated, and a perception that policy simulations are also an enjoyable way to formulate strategy (Geurts et al. 2007). Gaming puts the players in an ‘experiential learning’ situation, where they discover a concrete, realistic and complex initial situation, and the gaming process of going through multiple learning cycles helps them work through the situation as it unfolds. Policy gaming stimulates ‘learning how to learn’, as in a game, and learning by doing alternates with reflection and discussion. The progression through learning cycles can also be much faster than in real-life (Geurts et al. 2007: 548). The bottom line is that problem solving in policy development processes requires creative experimentation. This cannot be primarily taught via ‘camp-fire’ story telling learning mode but demands hands-on ‘veld learning’ that allow for safe creative and productive experimentation. This is exactly what good policy simulations provide (De Geus, 1997; Ringland, 2006). In simulations participants cannot view issues solely from either their own perspective or that of one dominant stakeholder (Geurts et al. 2007). Policy simulations enable the seeking of Consensus Games are popular because historically people seek and enjoy the tension of competition, positive rivalry and the procedural justice of impartiality in safe and regulated environments. As in games, simulations temporarily remove the participants from their daily routines, political pressures, and the restrictions of real-life protocols. In consensus building, participants engage in extensive debate and need to act on a shared set of meanings and beliefs to guide the policy process in the desired direction

#### ( ) That allows us to influence state policy AND is key to agency

Eijkman ‘12

[Henk. Prof Academic Development at Annasaheb Dange College of Engineering (India). “The Role of Simulations in the Authentic Learning for National Security Policy Development: Implications for Practice” 2012, <http://nsc.anu.edu.au/test/documents/Sims_in_authentic_learning_report.pdf> ]

However, whether as an approach to learning, innovation, persuasion or culture shift, policy simulations derive their power from two central features: their combination of simulation and gaming (Geurts et al. 2007). 1. The simulation element: the unique combination of simulation with role-playing. The unique simulation/role-play mix enables participants to create possible futures relevant to the topic being studied. This is diametrically opposed to the more traditional, teacher-centric approaches in which a future is produced for them. In policy simulations, possible futures are much more than an object of tabletop discussion and verbal speculation. ‘No other technique allows a group of participants to engage in collective action in a safe environment to create and analyse the futures they want to explore’ (Geurts et al. 2007: 536). 2. The game element: the interactive and tailor-made modelling and design of the policy game. The actual run of the policy simulation is only one step, though a most important and visible one, in a collective process of investigation, communication, and evaluation of performance. In the context of a post-graduate course in public policy development, for example, a policy simulation is a dedicated game constructed in collaboration with practitioners to achieve a high level of proficiency in relevant aspects of the policy development process. To drill down to a level of finer detail, policy development simulations—as forms of interactive or participatory modelling— are particularly effective in developing participant knowledge and skills in the five key areas of the policy development process (and success criteria), namely: Complexity, Communication, Creativity, Consensus, and Commitment to action (‘the five Cs’). The capacity to provide effective learning support in these five categories has proved to be particularly helpful in strategic decision-making (Geurts et al. 2007). Annexure 2.5 contains a detailed description, in table format, of the synopsis below.

### Ext. Roleplaying Solves Violence / Oppression

#### ( ) Dialogic democracy is the best way to dismantle racism—our vision of debate is the opposite of exclusion

Gooding-Williams ‘3

[Robert. “Race, Multiculturalism, and Democracy." Constellations, Vol 5 No 1. 2003. Robert Gooding-Williams (Ph.D., Yale, 1982) is the Ralph and Mary Otis Isham Professor of Political Science and the College. He is also a Faculty Associate of the Chicago Center for Contemporary Theory and an affiliate of the Center for the Study of Race, Politics and Culture. His areas of interest include Du Bois, Critical Race Theory, the History of African-American Political Thought, 19th Century German Philosophy (especially Nietzsche), Existentialism, and Aesthetics (including literature and philosophy, representations of race in film, and the literary theory and criticism of African-American literature). Before coming to the University of Chicago he taught at Northwestern University (1998-2005), where he was Professor of Philosophy, Director of the Alice Berline Kaplan Center for the Humanities (2003-2005), Adjunct Professor of African American Studies, and an affiliate of the Program in Critical Theory. Before coming to Northwestern he taught at Amherst College (1988-98), where he was Professor of Black Studies and the George Lyman Crosby 1896 Professor of Philosophy, and at Simmons College (1983-88), where he taught philosophy and directed the program in Afro-American Studies.]

I begin with the assumption that fostering the capacity for democratic deliber- ation is a central aim of public education in a democratic society.531 also follow a number of contemporary political theorists in supposing that democratic deliber- ation is a form of public reasoning geared towards adducing considerations that all parties to a given deliberation can find compelling.54 On this view, successful deliberation requires that co-deliberators cultivate a mutual understanding of the differences in conviction that divide them, so that they can formulate reasons (say for implementing or not implementing a proposed policy) that will be generally acceptable despite those differences.55 In the words of one theorist, "[deliberation encourages people with conflicting perspectives to understand each other's point of view, to minimize their moral disagreements, and to search for common ground."56 Lorenzo Simpson usefully glosses the pursuit of mutual understanding when he writes that it requires "a 'reversibility of perspectives,' not in the sense of my collapsing into yon or you into me, but in the sense that I try to understand - but not necessarily agree with - what you take your life to be about and you do the same for me . . . [i]n such a . . . mutual understanding you may come to alter the way in which you understand yourself and I . . . may find that listening to you leads me to alter my self-understanding."57 According to Simpson, the search for common ground need not leave us with the convictions with which we began. On the contrary, the process of democratic deliberation can be a source of self-trans- formation that enriches one's view of the issues at hand and even alters one's conception of the demands of social justice.58 In multicultural America, multicultural public education is a good that promotes mutual understanding across cultural differences, thereby fostering and strengthening citizens' capacities for democratic deliberation. In essence, multi- cultural education is a form of pedagogy whereby students study the histories and cultures of differently cultured fellow citizens, many of whose identities have a composite, multicultural character. More exactly, it is a form of cross-cultural hermeneutical dialogue, and therefore a way of entering into conversation with those histories and cultures.59 By disseminating the cultural capital of cross- cultural knowledge, multicultural education can cultivate citizens' abilities to "reverse perspectives." By facilitating mutual understanding, it can help them to shape shared vocabularies for understanding their moral and cultural identities and for finding common ground in their deliberations.60 By strengthening a student's ability to reverse perspectives, multicultural education may bolster her disposition to engage the self-understandings of differ- ently cultured others, even if the particulars of her multicultural education have not involved an engagement with the cultures of precisely those others (consider, e.g., someone whose multicultural education has included courses in Asian- American literatures, but who knows nothing of American Latino subcultures). Acquiring a know-how and a feel for cross-cultural hermeneutical conversation is likely to reinforce a student's inclination to understand and learn from the self- interpretations of cultural "others" in just the way that the cultivation of an athletic skill (e.g., the ability to "head" a soccer ball) tends to reinforce one's inclination to participate in the sports for which having that skill is an advantage (e.g. playing soccer). In the case of multicultural education, one cultivates a skill which is motivationally conducive to the sort of mutual understanding that is crit- ical to the flourishing of deliberative democracy in a multicultural society.61 Let me summarize my argument so far. In contrast to Schlesinger. who yearns for a society 111 which the understanding of key political ideals remains immune from deliberative debate animated by cultural and other group differences, I have been suggesting that deliberative debate of this sort is an appropriate medium for seeking and forging common grounds and ideals. I have also been arguing (1) that a commitment to deliberative democracy in multicultural America entails a commitment to promoting the mutual understanding of differences through cross-cultural dialogue and (2) that such a commitment justifies the institution of multicultural education. The promotion of mutual understanding avoids Schlesinger's and Asante's kitsch, because it is not predicated off an imperative to preserve an uncomplicated national or ethnic identity in the face of cultural and social complexity. Indeed, the ideal of mutual understanding invites increasing complexity by suggesting that cross-cultural educational insights, since they can effect changes in the self-understandings of persons who have benefitted from a multicultural education, may alter and further complicate those persons' identities, perhaps making them more multicultural. In what follows, I further explore the implications of this ideal by proposing that a commitment to deliberative democracy in multicultural America justifies a form of multicultural education that is, specifically race-conscious.

#### ( ) Refusal to roleplay as agents of the federal government ruins debate’s emancipatory potential because it turns it into a monologue – this destroys any chance of resolving the harms of the 1ac.

Walsh ‘8

[K. Prof Poli Sci Wisconsin. Talking about Race, 2008, Pg 197-99]

The investigations of intergroup dialogue in this study nevertheless present reasons to be cautious about how useful deliberative approaches can be in the realm of race relations. Even in these dialogues, not all participants are scrutinized to the same degree. These dialogues are a site in which conventional notions of authority are contested, but they seem at times to confer legitimacy on people of color without simultaneously requiring whites to assume an equal role in the exchange. In order for these dialogues to serve as a site in which motives and perceptions are open to scrutiny by listeners, everyone needs to contribute—people of dominant racial categories as well as people from marginalized racial groups. As suggested in the previous chapter, if whites mainly listen and only people of color speak, then the dialogues are not actually an exchange or a collective attempt to move a community forward.24 If only members of marginalized racial groups take on the role of speaker and are seldom in the role of listener, this may not constitute power over the conversation so much as a peculiar status. In such a situation, only their views—not the views of members of dominant racial groups—are subject to scrutiny. This reduces the potential of this public talk to serve as community- and actionproducing discussion. As Susan Bickford explains, Exempting some from listening (either implicitly or explicitly) can stifle the vitality of political interaction, and could also result in a kind of patronizing hierarchy of citizenship: certain citizens cannot be expected to exercise certain responsibilities and thus are somehow lacking, not wholly mature citizens. ... If I regard you as exempted from listening because of your oppression, I certainly am not regarding you as a partner in political action. It is as though I am doing something for you, rather than our acting together—or on a collective level, as though we are letting them into our public, rather than creating one together through speaking and listening.25 Intergroup dialogue needs to be civil enough for people to talk and share views. But for it to constitute a joint project, a credible joint attempt by people to understand their community and take steps to improve it, it has to involve the scrutiny of all participants.

#### ( ) Turns the case—only dialogue and decision-making allows long-term challenges to black oppression

Gooding-Williams ‘3

[Robert. “Race, Multiculturalism, and Democracy." Constellations, Vol 5 No 1. 2003. Robert Gooding-Williams (Ph.D., Yale, 1982) is the Ralph and Mary Otis Isham Professor of Political Science and the College. He is also a Faculty Associate of the Chicago Center for Contemporary Theory and an affiliate of the Center for the Study of Race, Politics and Culture. His areas of interest include Du Bois, Critical Race Theory, the History of African-American Political Thought, 19th Century German Philosophy (especially Nietzsche), Existentialism, and Aesthetics (including literature and philosophy, representations of race in film, and the literary theory and criticism of African-American literature). Before coming to the University of Chicago he taught at Northwestern University (1998-2005), where he was Professor of Philosophy, Director of the Alice Berline Kaplan Center for the Humanities (2003-2005), Adjunct Professor of African American Studies, and an affiliate of the Program in Critical Theory. Before coming to Northwestern he taught at Amherst College (1988-98), where he was Professor of Black Studies and the George Lyman Crosby 1896 Professor of Philosophy, and at Simmons College (1983-88), where he taught philosophy and directed the program in Afro-American Studies.]

Consider, for example, the view held by many (though not all) African Americans that the (comparatively) low, average socioeconomic status of African-Americans, because it is due to the cumulative effects of racial slavery and antiblack racism, is an injustice for which African Americans deserve compensation. Some white Americans will dismiss this assertion of injustice, largely because they are "reluctant to see the present social plight of blacks as the result of American slavery."65 Still, were these whites to learn something of American racial slavery and of its impact 011 African-American life, they could begin to see that the argument for reparations is plausible, and begin to share with the African-Americans who advance that argument a common moral ground for further deliberations, hi other words, through the study of African American social history, they could begin to acknowledge the cogency of the considerations in light of which many African-American black persons, in reflecting on that history, have insisted that being black in America involves collective injustice. Supposing that they augmented this study with inquiry into the central themes of African-American political thought66 (as it has evolved, say from the writings of Martin Delaney to those of Martin King), they could enlarge the common ground by beginning to recognize the range and force of African-American perspectives oil other race-related issues.¶ It would be a mistake, of course, to think that multiculturalism needs to be race-conscious only when addressing the self-understandings of black persons or, by analogy the self-understandings of racially classified but non-black "persons of color." America is also a nation of racially classified whites and white persons; and white personliood, we know, cuts across ethnic lines. Again, by analogy to blacks who become black persons, whites who become white persons let their descriptions of themselves as white matter to the ways in which they live their lives. David Roediger's work on the racial formation of Irish-American workers is relevant here, as it provides a model for historical inquiry that illuminates the social construction and etlmic cultural significance of white racial identities.67 Also important, in this context, is Toni Morrison's book. Playing in the Dark. Reflecting 011 the nature of American literature, Morrison writes: that cultural identities are formed and informed by a nation's literature, and... what seemed to be 011 the 'mind' of the literature of the United States was the selfconscious construction of the American as a new white man. Emerson's call for this new man 111 'The American Scholar" indicates the deliberateness of the construction the conscious necessity for establishing the difference. But the writers who responded to this call, accepting or rejecting it. did not look solely to Europe to establish a reference for difference. There was a very theatrical difference underfoot. Writers were able to celebrate and deplore an identity already existing or rapidly taking a form that was elaborated through racial difference. That difference provided a huge payout of sign, symbol, and agency in the process of organizing, separating, and consolidating identity . . .6S¶ For Morrison, reading American writers after Emerson (e.g.. Poe and Twain) is a matter of engaging complicated constructions of white racial identities implicated in a racial ideology ("American Africanism" is Morrison's phrase) that assigns multiple meanings to the African presence in America. Self-consciously constructing a literature in light of descriptions of themselves as white, the "founding writers of young America" were white persons (in my sense of the term) for whom the figure of the black African became a "staging ground and arena for the elaboration of the quintessential American identity."® For my purposes, Morrison's short study is valuable, because it affords some excellent examples of the ways multicultural inquiry can explore the cultural construction of white racial identities and their connection to the promotion of racial ideologies. In America, multicultural education cannot avoid race, because socially constructed racial identities - those of black persons and white persons alike come into view 110 matter what class or ethnic perpsective one occupies in crosscultural deliberations. And while one ought not to conflate multiculturalism with struggles against racism and economic injustice, or promote it as a substitute for such straggles, multicultural education, by being race conscious, can contribute to an understanding of the issues posed by these struggles.70

### Ext. Roleplaying Key to Agency (Also AT//Passivity)

#### ( )Roleplaying is key to effective agency

Hanghøj ‘8

[Thorkild. Since this PhD project began in 2004, the present author has been affiliated with DREAM (Danish¶ Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials), which is located at the Institute of¶ Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. Research visits have¶ taken place at the Centre for Learning, Knowledge, and Interactive Technologies (L-KIT), the¶ Institute of Education at the University of Bristol and the institute formerly known as Learning Lab¶ Denmark at the School of Education, University of Aarhus, where he currently works as an assistant¶ professor. “Playful Knowledge: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming” PhD Dissertation at The Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. 2008, <http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information_til/Studerende_ved_SDU/Din_uddannelse/phd_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf>]

Thus, debate games require teachers to balance the centripetal/centrifugal forces of gaming and teaching, to be able to reconfigure their discursive authority, and to orchestrate the multiple voices of a dialogical game space in relation to particular goals. These Bakhtinian perspectives provide a valuable analytical framework for describing the discursive interplay between different practices and knowledge aspects when enacting (debate) game scenarios. In addition to this, Bakhtin’s dialogical philosophy also offers an explanation of why debate games (and other game types) may be valuable within an educational context. One of the central features of multi-player games is that players are expected to experience a simultaneously real and imagined scenario both in relation to an insider’s (participant) perspective and to an outsider’s (co-participant) perspective. According to Bakhtin, the outsider’s perspective reflects a fundamental aspect of human understanding: In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding – in time, in space, in culture. For one cannot even really see one's own exterior and comprehend it as a whole, and no mirrors or photographs can help; our real exterior can be seen and understood only by other people, because they are located outside us in space, and because they are others (Bakhtin, 1986: 7). As the quote suggests, every person is influenced by others in an inescapably intertwined way, and consequently no voice can be said to be isolated. Thus, it is in the interaction with other voices that individuals are able to reach understanding and find their own voice. Bakhtin also refers to the ontological process of finding a voice as “ideological becoming”, which represents “the process of selectively assimilating the words of others” (Bakhtin, 1981: 341). Thus, by teaching and playing debate scenarios, it is possible to support students in their process of becoming not only themselves, but also in becoming articulate and responsive citizens in a democratic society.

#### ( ) *Only* agency achieved in via policy debate creates effective change

Hanghøj ‘8

[Thorkild. Since this PhD project began in 2004, the present author has been affiliated with DREAM (Danish¶ Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials), which is located at the Institute of¶ Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. Research visits have¶ taken place at the Centre for Learning, Knowledge, and Interactive Technologies (L-KIT), the¶ Institute of Education at the University of Bristol and the institute formerly known as Learning Lab¶ Denmark at the School of Education, University of Aarhus, where he currently works as an assistant¶ professor. “Playful Knowledge: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming” PhD Dissertation at The Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. 2008, <http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information_til/Studerende_ved_SDU/Din_uddannelse/phd_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf>]

Among educational theorists, John Dewey is well-known for stressing the learning potential of play and game activities within education (Makedon, 1993; Vaage, 2000). Thus, Dewey devotes an entire chapter in Democracy and Education to “Play and Work in the Curriculum”. In tune with the main argument presented throughout the book, he begins the chapter by noting that it is “desirable” that education, as such, starts “from and with the experience and capacities of learners” (Dewey, 1916: 202). This can be done through the “the introduction of forms of activity, in play and work, similar to those in which children and youth engage outside of school” (Dewey, 1916: 202). Dewey makes no fundamental distinction between play and work activities, as they “both involve ends consciously entertained and the selection and adaptation of materials and processes designed to affect the desired ends” (Dewey, 1916: 210). Thus, play and work mostly differ in terms of “timespans”, which “influence the directness of means and ends” (Dewey, 1916: 210). In this sense, play and work activities simply represent two different aspects on a continuum of meaningful relations between ends and means. This assertion also goes against the commonsensical notion that play is goal-free or is an end in itself. In summary, Dewey views play as being meaningful, goal-oriented, and interestbased. Moreover, play is free and plastic as it is both directed toward present and future (projected) activities (cf. chapter 2). However, in order to realise the educational value of play it is necessary to understand play as an imaginative activity (Dewey, 1916: 245). Play activities are too important to be reduced to a purely developmental phenomenon among children: It is still usual to regard this [imaginative] activity as a specially marked-off stage of childish growth, and to overlook the fact that the difference between play and what is regarded as serious employment should be not a difference between the presence and absence of imagination, but a difference in the materials with which imagination is occupied (Dewey, 1916: 245). In this way, play is closely linked with the imagination, which is “the medium of realization of every kind of thing which lies beyond the scope of direct physical response” (Dewey, 1916: 245). Put differently, Dewey’s conception of imagination represents “the capacity to concretely perceive what is before us in light of what could be” (Fesmire, 2003: 65). Thus, the educational value of play activities must be based on the understanding that: The imagination is as much a normal and integral part of human activity as is muscular movement. The educative value of manual activities and of laboratory exercises, as well as of play, depends upon the extent in which they aid in bringing about a sensing of the meaning of what is going on. In effect, if not in name, they are dramatizations. Their utilitarian value in forming habits of skill to be used for tangible results is important, but not when isolated from the appreciative side. Were it not for the accompanying play of imagination, there would be no road from a direct activity to representative knowledge; for it is by imagination that symbols are translated over into a direct meaning and integrated with a narrower activity so as to expand and enrich it (Dewey, 1916: 245-6; my emphasis added). Play activity as such is no guarantee for avoiding “mechanical methods in teaching” (Dewey, 1916: 245). Thus, the value of educational gaming is entirely dependent upon whether the imaginative aspects of play are able to support students understanding of “what is going on”. In this way, imaginative play allows meaning to be created through “dramatizations” of particular aspects of knowledge. Consequently, the presumably distinct categories of imagination and reality represent a subtle continuum of finely graded experience as human beings do not experience reality directly but always through symbols, language, and social interaction (Waskul & Lust, 2004

#### ( ) Key to agency

Kulynych ‘97

Jessica Kulynych, Asst Professor of Political Science at Winthrop University, Polity, Winter, 1997, n2 p315(32)

When we look at the success of citizen initiatives from a performative perspective, we look precisely at those moments of defiance and disruption that bring the invisible and unimaginable into view. Although citizens were minimally successful in influencing or controlling the outcome of the policy debate and experienced a considerable lack of autonomy in their coercion into the technical debate, the goal-oriented debate within the energy commissions could be seen as a defiant moment of performative politics. The existence of a goal-oriented debate within a technically dominated arena defied the normalizing separation between expert policymakers and consuming citizens. Citizens momentarily recreated themselves as policymakers in a system that defined citizens out of the policy process, thereby refusing their construction as passive clients. The disruptive potential of the energy commissions continues to defy technical bureaucracy even while their decisions are non-binding. SHE CONTINUES… Consider, for example, a public hearing. When seen from a discursive legitimation perspective, deliberation and debate are about the sincere, controlled attempt to discern the best, most rational, least biased arguments that most precisely express an interlocutor’s ideas and interests. In practice, however, deliberation is a much less deliberative and much more performative activity. The literary aspects of debate – irony, satire, sarcasm, and wit – work precisely on the slippage between what is said and what is meant, or what can be said and what can be conceived. Strategies such as humor are not merely rational, but visceral and often uncontrollable, as is the laughter that is evoked from such strategies. Performative actions are not alternative ways of deliberating; rather they are agonistic expressions of what cannot be captured by deliberative rationality. As such, they resist the confines of that rationality and gesture toward places where words, arguments, and claims are not enough. Without an understanding of the performative aspects of political action, Hager cannot explain how citizens are able to introduce genuinely new and different “ways of perceiving and naming the world” into a realm where such epistemic standards are unimaginable. It is in the process of acting as citizens in a technical bureaucratic setting, where citizen action is by definition precluded, that alternative, epistemic standards of evaluation become possible. Only when scholars recognize the performative will they be able to grasp the intricacies of contemporary political actions and the possibilities for an actually diverse and participatory democracy.

### AT//Role Confusion

#### ( ) No link—our interpretation is explicit about the need to play the federal government, but this doesn’t mean we are the federal government—playing the game Axis and Allies doesn’t make you a Nazi; actors who play Nero don’t actually want to burn Rome; and this argument is downright insulting—this is based on the assumption that people are so stupid that explicitly playing a part will confuse them into believing it—all historical evidence disproves this

#### ( ) The argument solves itself—just being aware of role confusion should be enough to stop it—if their argument is that we will believe the other side is actually correct, this only begs the question of whether change is a good idea at all

#### ( ) Extend McClean – roleplaying’s good – produces the best decisionmaking skills which produces better advocates – and here’s comparative evidence that outweighs role confusion

Andrews ‘6

(Peter, Consulting Faculty Member at the IBM Executive Business Institute in Palisades, New York, Executive Technology Report, August, www-935.ibm.com/services/us/bcs/pdf/g510-6313-etr-unlearn-to-innovate.pdf)

Dare to believe that the impossible ideas might be true How does your list of new ideas help with unlearning? It provides alternative views to directly challenge your set beliefs and frameworks. It provides the grains of sand that are the beginnings for pearls of wisdom. But only if you are willing to suspend disbelief. The natural tendency is to sift your ideas based on the ones that have clear, apparent value, that “make the most sense.” Often these ideas prove themselves right away. But none of these is likely to help with unlearning or to lead to truly disruptive innovations. Instead of categorizing and prioritizing your long (20 or more) list of ideas, give the ones that are the most intriguing and the most improbable a chance. See if you can talk yourself into them. If you do this well, you can use your arguments as a wedge to crack open your patterns of thought and action. If you can put together a line of reasoning that can convince others, you’ll be forced to reconsider and reformulate your own views. There is a danger to this. For the sake of argument (literally), Mark Twain built a case for Bacon’s being the author of Shakespeare’s plays. He started out believing the opposite and ended up convincing himself. But ultimately, you need to find a way to trust an alternate reality, at least for awhile. If you don’t take crazy ideas seriously, you can’t give them a fair chance and make them your own.

### AT//State Bad = No Roleplaying

#### ( ) Our framework doesn’t embrace the state nor does it force you to do so. The affirmative should defend action by the federal government – not the desirability of its existence. And if the state is bad that’s a reason we should debate about it.

#### ( ) Role playing as the government is key to engaged learning, innovation, and compromise—it’s empirically successful

Esberg and Sagan ‘12

(Esberg, Jane, BA in International Relations from Stanford and Government Fellow at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, and Sagan, Scott D., Professor of Political Science at Stanford and Senior Fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation, February 17, 2012, “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy”, The Nonproliferation Review, Vol. 19 No. 1, Francis & Taylor)

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by students in educational simulations. Government participants learn about the importance of understanding foreign perspectives, the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and thinking more creatively about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 The skills of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests and reactions remain critical for real-world foreign policy makers. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7

By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises force students to challenge their assumptions about how other governments behave and how their own government works.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, educational literature has expounded on their benefits, from encouraging engagement by breaking from the typical lecture format, to improving communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to link fact and theory, providing a context for facts while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 Role-playing exercises certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a more active style. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

#### ( ) Including the State in our discussion is the only way to change it – their framework makes worse every evil they’ve identified

Walt ‘91

(Stephen, Professor at the University of Chicago, International Studies Quarterly 35)

A second norm is relevance, a belief that even highly abstract lines of inquiry should be guided by the goal of solving real-world problems. Because the value of a given approach may not be apparent at the beginning–game theory is an obvious example–we cannot insist that a new approach be immediately applicable to a specific research puzzle. On the whole, however, the belief that scholarship in security affairs should be linked to real-world issues has prevented the field from degenerating into self-indulgent intellectualizing. And from the Golden Age to the present, security studies has probably had more real-world impact, for good or ill, than most areas of social science. Finally, the renaissance of security studies has been guided by a commitment to democratic discourse. Rather than confining discussion of security issues to an elite group of the best and brightest, scholars in the renaissance have generally welcomed a more fully informed debate. To paraphrase Clemenceau, issues of war and peace are too important to be left solely to insiders with a vested interest in the outcome. The growth of security studies within universities is one sign of broader participation, along with increased availability of information and more accessible publications for interested citizens. Although this view is by no means universal, the renaissance of security studies has been shaped by the belief that a well-informed debate is the best way to avoid the disasters that are likely when national policy is monopolized by a few self-interested parties.

### AT//Slaves to the State

#### ( ) Talking about the state doesn’t enslave us to it

Risse 2k

[Thomas, Professor of Political Science, Free University of Berlin , International Organization, “Lets Argue: Communicative Action in World Politics” p10-11]

Habermas posits that our communicative practices work and are effective only because we assume that we can revert to argumentation in order to challenge validity claims made in our daily utterances. Communicative processes oriented toward achieving mutual understanding counterfactually presuppose an ‘‘ideal speech situation’’ whereby nothing but the better arguments count and where actors try to persuade each other and are themselves open to being convinced: In this sense, communicative action points to an argumentation in which participants justify their validity claims in front of an ideally extended audience. Participants in argumentation proceed from the idealized assumption of a community of communication (Kommunikationsgemeinschaft) which is debordered from social space and historical time. They must . . . presuppose the possibility of an ideal community ‘‘within’’ their real social situation. Interests and identities are no longer fixed, but subject to interrogation and challenges and, thus, to change. The goal of the discursive interaction is to achieve argumentative consensus with the other, not to push through one’s own view of the world or moral values. Since the validity claims of identities and interests are at stake in theoretical and practical discourses, an argumentative consensus has constitutive effects on actors. This point helps to clarify the mutual constitutiveness of agents and social structure that social constructivism emphasizes. Agents are not simply the puppets of social structure, since they can actively challenge the validity claims inherent in any communicative action. At the same time, they are social agents that produce and reproduce the intersubjective structures of meanings through their communicative practices. Argumentative rationality in the Habermasian sense is based on several preconditions. First, argumentative consensus seeking requires the ability to empathize, that is, to see things through the eyes of one’s interaction partner. Second, actors need to share a ‘‘common lifeworld’’ (gemeinsame Lebenswelt), a supply of collective interpretations of the world and of themselves, as provided by language, a common history, or culture. A common lifeworld consists of a shared culture, a common system of norms and rules perceived as legitimate, and the social identity of actors being capable of communicating and acting. It provides arguing actors with a repertoire of collective understandings to which they can refer when making truth claims. At the same time, communicative action and its daily practices reproduce the common lifeworld. Finally, actors need to recognize each other as equals and have equal access to the discourse, which must also be open to other participants and be public in nature. In this sense then, relationships of power, force, and coercion are assumed absent when argumentative consensus is sought. This implies respect for two principles: all interested parties may participate in the argumentative discourse, and all participants have equal rights concerning making an argument or challenging a validity claim.

### AT//Limits Bad – General

#### Not all limits are created equal – the parameters that we set on debate are not the same ones that they’ve indicted (explain).

#### ( ) The taboo on anything that might be “limiting” creates paralysis –their criticism of makes the perfect the enemy of the good. The best we can do is fashion reasonable *middle ground* that fosters discussion

Beahrs ‘92

[John O. Beahrs- Department of Psychiatry, Oregon Health Sciences University- Dec., 1992, Paradoxical Effects in Political Systems, Political Psychology, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Dec., 1992), pp. 755-769, jstor]

New taboos have emerged that reflect new societal myths along with the pervasive aversion to the acceptance of limits and boundaries. Any hint of favoring the promotion of death, discrimination, injustice, deprivation, or hardship currently carries the implication of unacceptable evil. This climate no doubt arose in part from a reaction to earlier social traumata, and reflects a degree of healthy awakening from earlier self-idealization. At the same time, these taboos now impose a subtle tyranny of their own, which can foster bad outcomes by dampening the open discussion needed for effective problem-solving. They are reviewed in turn, defining their tacit underlying assumptions and potentials for negative paradox of their own. One major taboo is death-tacitly assumed to be unacceptable and correctible, or whose prevention is of ultimate value compared to other values. The taboo against contrary data can take several forms. Extreme "pro-lifeism," by preventing therapeutic abortion, may devastate the quality of life. Failure to allow medical euthanasia or rational suicide may threaten life at other levels by diverting health care funds from areas where they could be better used. Phobic avoidance of preventable death (such as the death penalty for hard-core evildoers, risk to terrorists' hostages) may so limit our ability to deal with both crime and terrorism that these evils will also escalate and claim far more innocent victims than otherwise. The taboo against death often worsens its cruel impact. A second taboo is discrimination, which suppresses the fact that what distinguishes complex living systems from an undifferentiated cell is cooperative division of labor-an inherently discriminative process. Having arisen as a corrective to gross racial and sexual injustice, this taboo now fosters several types of paradoxical effect. The leveling process could lead toward a common standard of mediocrity, or alternatively, to the paradox of communism, which rather than a classless society creates a rigid dichotomy between a massive underprivileged sector and a tiny ruling elite (Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1989). Antidiscrimination statutes may hamstring employers, who fear that effective action against problem employees will bring civil liberties reprisals. Gone too far, this can demoralize the productive sector to the point of a lowered economic base, worsening the plight of the disadvantaged who always bear the brunt of hard times. Another taboo, injustice, discounts the fact that many aspects of life are inherently unfair, and that simple tragedies do occur for which nobody should be blamed. This fosters excessive litigation, which may create new injustice in several ways: (1) driving individuals out of high-risk professions like obstetrics, thus depriving their clientele of vital services; (2) driving up the cost of services to a level where they become less availablet o the disadvantaged;a nd (3) simply shifting the burden of unfairness to those who may be held accountable for matters not properly their responsibility. A fourth taboo, against deprivation, hardship, and even simple unpleasure, reflects the social aversion to limits in any form. This fosters paradoxical effects now manifest in personal ethics, mental health, and social service agencies. The ethic of "self-actualization," by undercutting the vital roles of commitment and fidelity, leads to dissolving the social cement provided by stable families, yielding far more despair and less actualization of human potential. In mental health practice, failure to set effective limits fosters regressive dependency and worsens many patients' disorders; conversely, enforcing higher patient responsibilities improves these disorders (Halleck, 1988; Beahrs, 1990c). Welfare recipients are plagued by many anti-incentives that make upward mobility difficult, while dependency on their benefactors threatens their basic autonomy, leading to demoralization and worsening their overall plight (Mead, 1986). All these taboos share a common form: striving to remold society into an ideal of what it "ought" to be. This task becomes self-defeating when important aspects of reality are ignored, which then come back to yield the unexpected effect. To try to change what can only be accepted or simply endured, as in struggling to "close the generation gap," creates a "Utopia syndrome" in which the inevitable stresses of life are unnecessarily transformed into major problems (Watzlawicke t al., 1974). If there is any single feature characteristic of today's contemporary domestic malaise, it is probably the extent to which Utopian thinking dominates current mythology. The apparent corrective is greater realism. Pitted against this reasoning, however, is that many correctible evils have been pushed aside by despots throughout history, with rationalizations frighteningly similar to the above arguments: that such evils are "facts of life" or inviolate "human nature" (Kohn, 1986). Earlier this century, not employing appropriate correctives first prolonged the economic tyranny of the great trusts, and later failed to prevent the global destruction of the Second World War. The traumatization of these earlier years along with increased awareness of our own potential for evil, probably fuels the current quest for Utopia. Thus, in essence, the current paradoxes mirror the earlier ones. This dilemma cannot be resolved without answering the question of "human nature," differentiating what is "realistic" from Utopian self-deceptions that almost inevitably yield paradoxical effects. This is the task of all the human sciences and their primary bridge to public policy (Wilson, 1978). Yet, burgeoning data from many levels has so far strikingly failed to establish relevance to the actual world of subtle forces and counterforces in which political leaders operate (Jervis, 1989). For the time being, it may be wise to conclude that human nature remains an ideological concept without proven substantive validity (Berry, 1986). At the same time, it is a concept of such pivotal importance to political psychology that new scientific data must be continually scrutinized toward its clarification.

### AT//Limits Aren’t Fair

#### ( ) Only formal, pre-agreed rules can ensure openness and equal access—throwing away limits doesn’t mean debate becomes more egalitarian; it means those with the most power dominate the discussion- turns the aff

Tonn ‘5

[Mari Boor Tonn, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, 2005

“Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public ,” Rhetoric & Public Affairs 8.3 (2005) 405-430]

Second, democratic processes and public problem solving necessarily diverge from social conversations by articulating objectives at the outset; adhering to formal rules for participating in, managing, and achieving problem resolution; and documenting outcomes. Through the scrupulous recording of motions, discussions, amendments, and votes, the dynamics of such joint action are rendered visible, accessible, and retrievable, even to persons not party to the immediate deliberative process. "Democracies," Schudson writes, "put great store in the power of writing to secure, verify, and make public. Democracies require public memories."32 Thus, contrary to the framing of conversation and dialogue as egalitarian public problem-solving models, they, in truth, can reify pecking orders by licensing group members with social authority to set agendas, steer and dominate discussion, and—absent the polling and recording of votes—interpret the "will" of the group. Moreover, such informal processes can reward those who speak the loudest, the longest, are the most articulate, or even the most recalcitrant. Freeman's analysis of consciousness-raising groups is instructive: At any small group meeting anyone with a sharp eye and an acute ear can tell who is influencing whom. The members of the friendship group will relate more to each other than to other people. They listen more attentively, and interrupt less; they repeat each other's points and tend to give in amiably; they tend to ignore or grapple with the "outs" whose approval is not necessary for making a decision . . . They are nuances of interaction, not prewritten scripts. But they are discernible, and they do have their effect. Once one knows . . . whose approval is the stamp of acceptance, one knows who is running things.33 As a result, Freeman argues that purportedly "structureless" organizations are a "deceptive . . . smokescreen," given that "'structurelessness' does not prevent the formation of informal structures, but only formal ones . . . For everyone to have the opportunity to be involved . . . and to participate . . . the structure must be explicit, not implicit. The rules of decision-making must be open and available to everyone, and this can only happen if they are formalized."34 Schudson likewise argues that the inherently "threatening" nature of political deliberation demands procedures guaranteeing "equal access to the [End Page 411] floor, equal participation in setting the ground rules for discussion, and a set of ground rules designed to encourage pertinent speaking, attentive listening, appropriate simplifications, and widely apportioned speaking rights."35

### AT//Limits Hurt Agency

#### ( ) Humans define their identity through the limits between self and other- their aversion to constraint causes psychological overload

Beahrs ‘92

[John O. Beahrs- Department of Psychiatry, Oregon Health Sciences University- Dec., 1992, Paradoxical Effects in Political Systems, Political Psychology, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Dec., 1992), pp. 755-769, jstor]

**The ideal of unlimited expansion is a myth**, **which excludes awareness of a** **most critical datum**: that **limits and** boundaries **are vital constituents of human** **health**. Constraints like ethics and the law limit freedom at one level but enhance it overall (Beahrs, 1977, 1986). Similarly, one can define who one is only by defining what one is not-the process of setting limits and boundaries. More than usually believed, this involves excluding options that may be as valid as those that are embraced, which thus requires strong personal choices in the absence of ultimate guidelines. Avoiding this difficult task leads to diffusion of both individual and collective identity . . . a problem widely noted in contemporary America. In the arena of actual living, the alternatives for identity-formation are usually narrowed by constraints that are "given." For individuals, these include constitutional and environmental contingencies largely beyond a growing child's control (Freud, 1966/1916). For societies, geographical features like Great Britain's insular status interact with preexisting traditions and pressures from neighboring groups. In the era when America's physical boundaries seemed endless, the choices available to specific individuals were usually kept within manageable bounds by such givens. As science and technology removed these constraints, one after another, both individuals and society were left with having to make choices in these new areas where we were ill-prepared. Diffusion of identity thus arises in part from uncertainty, which becomes more problematic as the explosion of available information and viable options undercuts the comparative simplicity on which identity formation thrives. In America, the traditional aversion to limits compounds the already difficult task of adapting to this novel source of stress. Resulting conditions of social mobility, moder communications, and cultural homogeonisation also work against social identity-formation( Bloom, 1990).

#### ( ) Our dialogue arguments solve this – roleplaying is key to effective agency

Hanghøj ‘8

[Thorkild. Since this PhD project began in 2004, the present author has been affiliated with DREAM (Danish¶ Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials), which is located at the Institute of¶ Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. Research visits have¶ taken place at the Centre for Learning, Knowledge, and Interactive Technologies (L-KIT), the¶ Institute of Education at the University of Bristol and the institute formerly known as Learning Lab¶ Denmark at the School of Education, University of Aarhus, where he currently works as an assistant¶ professor. “Playful Knowledge: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming” PhD Dissertation at The Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. 2008, <http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information_til/Studerende_ved_SDU/Din_uddannelse/phd_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf>]

Thus, debate games require teachers to balance the centripetal/centrifugal forces of gaming and teaching, to be able to reconfigure their discursive authority, and to orchestrate the multiple voices of a dialogical game space in relation to particular goals. These Bakhtinian perspectives provide a valuable analytical framework for describing the discursive interplay between different practices and knowledge aspects when enacting (debate) game scenarios. In addition to this, Bakhtin’s dialogical philosophy also offers an explanation of why debate games (and other game types) may be valuable within an educational context. One of the central features of multi-player games is that players are expected to experience a simultaneously real and imagined scenario both in relation to an insider’s (participant) perspective and to an outsider’s (co-participant) perspective. According to Bakhtin, the outsider’s perspective reflects a fundamental aspect of human understanding: In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding – in time, in space, in culture. For one cannot even really see one's own exterior and comprehend it as a whole, and no mirrors or photographs can help; our real exterior can be seen and understood only by other people, because they are located outside us in space, and because they are others (Bakhtin, 1986: 7). As the quote suggests, every person is influenced by others in an inescapably intertwined way, and consequently no voice can be said to be isolated. Thus, it is in the interaction with other voices that individuals are able to reach understanding and find their own voice. Bakhtin also refers to the ontological process of finding a voice as “ideological becoming”, which represents “the process of selectively assimilating the words of others” (Bakhtin, 1981: 341). Thus, by teaching and playing debate scenarios, it is possible to support students in their process of becoming not only themselves, but also in becoming articulate and responsive citizens in a democratic society.

### AT//Limits Stifle Creativity

#### ( ) Constraints are key to creativity – challenging ourselves to innovate within the confines of rules creates comparatively more creative solutions than your “blank slate” approach

Mayer ‘6

[Marissa. VP of User Experience at Google. “Creativity Loves Constraints” BusinessWeek, 2/13/6 ln]

When people think about creativity, they think about artistic work -- unbridled, unguided effort that leads to beautiful effect. But if you look deeper, you'll find that some of the most inspiring art forms, such as haikus, sonatas, and religious paintings, are fraught with constraints. They are beautiful because creativity triumphed over the "rules." Constraints shape and focus problems and provide clear challenges to overcome. Creativity thrives best when constrained.¶ But constraints must be balanced with a healthy disregard for the impossible. Too many curbs can lead to pessimism and despair. Disregarding the bounds of what we know or accept gives rise to ideas that are non-obvious, unconventional, or unexplored. The creativity realized in this balance between constraint and disregard for the impossible is fueled by passion and leads to revolutionary change.¶ A few years ago, I met Paul Beckett, a talented designer who makes sculptural clocks. When I asked him why not do just sculptures, Paul said he liked the challenge of making something artistically beautiful that also had to perform as a clock. Framing the task in that way freed his creative force. Paul reflected that he also found it easier to paint on a canvas that had a mark on it rather than starting with one that was entirely clean and white. This resonated with me. It is often easier to direct your energy when you start with constrained challenges (a sculpture that must be a clock) or constrained possibilities (a canvas that is marked).

#### ( ) Abolishing constraints does not improve creativity---starting from defined constraints like the topic is better for overall creativity because innovative thinking comes from problem-solving like figuring out how to read what you want to read while still being topical

Intrator ‘10

[David. President of the Creative Organization. “Thinking Inside the Box” 10/21/10 www.trainingmag.com ]

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” ¶ As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” ¶ The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. ¶ In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. ¶ But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic.¶ It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box.¶ One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities.¶ What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution.¶ This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally.¶ Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary.¶ More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like.¶ Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered.¶ But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works.¶ That’s the hard part.¶ It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated.¶ It also can be emotionally difficult.¶ You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

### AT//We Create Sufficient Limits

#### ( ) No, you don’t – the number of potential advocacies are unrestrained – only our framework sets an effective cap on the topic

Smith ‘7

[Ross. Former Director of Debate at WFU. ¶ Posting to eDebate [the college debate listserve], 4/04, http://www.ndtceda.com/pipermail/edebate/2007-April/070516.html)]

Policy: a course of action undertaken by an agent. We are all policy makers every time we decide to undertake a course of action. Most policies are non-governmental. We have an obligation to ourselves and others to be good policy makers and advocates of good policies when dealing with others in our spheres of influence. Policy Deliberation and Debate: a METHOD for making and advocating better policy decisions. Intercollegiate debate about PUBLIC policy: a useful way of teaching the SKILLS needed for successful use of a METHOD of making and advocating good decisions. Public policy topics are especially useful because the research base is public. While we could debate about private actions by private agents, we have no way of poviding equal access to the kinds of information that would help make those debates good ones. There is a side benefit that some of what we learn about the public policy topics sometimes informs our later lives as citizens engaged in public deliberation regarding those same policies, but that is not the primary reason that public policy topics are necessary. Andy Ellis is a policy maker. He makes decisions about courses of action for himself and for/with others. But a topic about what Andy Ellis should do is inaccessable and, frankly, largely none of our business. But Andy Ellis has been well served by having the training in one of the better methods of choosing among and advocating whatever policies he is responsible for. That method is policy debate.

### AT//You Exclude Us

#### ( ) Necessary trade-off – The goal of our interpretation is not to exclude your aff, but to create a common ground for debate that allows us to maximize its immense educational and intellectual potential – There will always be some “issue” we exclude, but this is a necessary evil in pursuit of a manageable framework for comprehensive and productive discussion.

#### ( ) There's a difference between argumentative exclusion and ontological exclusion—the former is inevitable because of time limits, affs implicitly requiring us to make responsive arguments instead of free expression, or any counter-interpretation of any kind. Our framework deploys minimal argumentative exclusion based on the resolution to enable clash and testing processes that prevent ontological exclusion wrought by one-sided dialogues and monopolized prep and the type of mindsets those things encourage.

#### ( ) Other opportunities – They can read their aff on the negative or discuss it in any other deliberative or education setting – just because it doesn’t belong on this topic’s agenda does not mean it can never be discussed.

#### ( ) No link: dialectical responsiveness is distinct from exclusion because conversations must be goal-oriented to settle a certain question for the ballot to make sense—their offense doesn’t assume game spaces

Walton ‘4

(Douglas, Full Professor of Philosophy – U Winnipeg, Relevance in Argumentation, p. 169-170)

The kind of relevance defined in the new theory can be called dialectical relevance, meaning that an argument, a question, or other type of speech act is judged to be relevant insofar as it plays a part, or has a function, in a goal-directed conversation that is a dialogue exchange between two participants who are aware of each other’s moves. The ultimate aim of a system of dialectical relevance is to be useful in judging cases for material relevance, primarily cases where an argument is central. To judge whether a given argument is normatively relevant, basically one has to judge whether, as used in the given case, it meets the normative standards of reasonable argument appropriate for that case. To determine what normative standard is appropriate, one has to ask the basic question, What purpose is the argument supposedly being used for? To answer that question, one has to examine the evidence given in the text and context of dialogue in that case and ask what type of dialogue this case is supposed to be part of. Then the more detailed evaluation can go from there, depending on the goal of that type of dialogue. For example, suppose the dialogue is supposed to be a critical discussion. The purpose of a critical discussion is to resolve a conflict of opinions. Thus, the argument in the given case can be judged to be relevant if it used in such a way as to contribute to the resolution of the conflict of opinions supposedly at issue in the critical discussion. The argument is relevant if it contributes to the goal of the critical discussion at whatever stage it was used. It is irrelevant if it does not. Why should argumentation in a natural conversation be assumed to be goal directed? One might object that a lot of the ordinary conversations we have in everyday life do not appear to be goal directed. Two people may meet in the street and have a casual conversation about whether it is a nice day or not. It would seem to be artificial to describe their conversation as goal directed, implying that the two had agreed in advance to undertake this argument about the weather for some specific purpose. If they switch to talking about something else, is that a bad thing? Should it be criticized as “irrelevant”? If not, the problem is that a criticism of irrelevance seems arbitrary or even unfair. The solution to this problem is to clearly recognize that judgments about the dialectical relevance of an argument confer a stamp of approval of admissibility on the argument as rational or as used correctly in a given case with respect to its serving some purpose. To say that an argument is dialectically relevant or irrelevant is not to say that it is faulty or fallacious in every respect or that it has been incorrectly with respect to every goal that the participants are trying to achieve in a given case. There is a parallel here with applying deductive logic to arguments. To say that an argument is deductively valid is not to say that is good argument in every respect or that it is fallacy free. For a deductively valid argument could be based on false premises, or it could be a circular argument, or it could exhibit many kinds of faults. To say that an argument is deductively valid is only to say that the argument is correct or rational in a conditional sense—it is to say that if the premises are true, then the conclusion must (by logical necessity) be true too. Comparably, to say that an argument is dialectically relevant in a given case is not to say that the argument is perfectly rational, in relation to any goals that might be important the participants. It is only to say that it has the potential to be used correctly or rationally in a conditional or instrumental sense. It is to say that the argument has the potential to be used in such a way as to contribute to the type of discussion the participants are supposed to be engaged in. But you can always raise the question of what type of discussion the participants should really be engaged in. You can ask whether the agenda of that discussion ought to be changed if they are to solve the underlying problem they confront. So if two disputants are arguing about the weather, and one of them suddenly starts to argue about baseball or the price of new cars, the switch of topics is not necessarily a bad thing at all. But from the perspective of the two arguers who hope to resolve their difference of opinions about the weather by using rational argumentation, the switch to baseball may be viewed as dialectically irrelevant. This means that it turns the argumentation away from the direction needed for fulfilling its original purpose. At any rate, we can see that dialectical relevance has its place. Although it is not a requirement of all human communication, it is a useful requirement for reasoned argumentation of various kinds that are quite important in human communication.

#### ( ) Net offense—only our model of competition produces the tools necessary to stop exclusion

Glover ‘8

Glover, Robert. "Scattergories: Towards an Agonistic Critique of the Re-Categorization of American Citizenship in a Globalized Era" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the APSA 2008 Annual Meeting, Hynes Convention Center, Boston, Massachusetts, Aug 28, 2008 <Not Available>. 2011-03-11 http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p278147\_index.html Ph.D. Candidate, Political Science, University of Connecticut Primary Fields: Political Theory, International Relations Dissertation Title: Citizenship Unhinged—Exploring the Potential of Agonistic Citizenship, Ph.D. Projected Completion Spring of 2010.

Agonistic pluralism, or agonism, advances a conception of politics in which contestation and conflictual engagement become the goal of our political encounters, rather than seeking harmonious social cooperation. Most variants of agonism do not simply “celebrate a world without points of stabilization”, as we might find in more avowedly postmodern conceptions of politics, yet agonism does recognize the “perpetuity” and enduring nature of contestation (Honig 1993, 15). The exercise of coercive power, exclusion, and hegemonic marginalization are enduring features of modern politics from this perspective. Rather than seeking to eliminate these features, agonism calls upon us to engage and re-engage these moments in the most inclusive and contentious democratic settings possible, allowing a multiplicity of voices to engage in the struggle for hegemony (Goi 2005, 60). The question remains however as to what an agonistic approach can do to resolve the inherent conflict within American citizenship18. Yet this would be to mis-frame the question as agonistic conceptions would not advance a “resolution”, but rather a continuous re-vision and reworking of previous resolutions. I will suggest that agonistic democratic theory offers us three valuable critical insights with regard to contemporary American citizenship. First and foremost, an agonistic approach to citizenship engages the paradoxical and contradictory foundations of citizenship in the U.S. as a constitutive and productive tension, rather than as a “problem” to be transcended or avoided. Second, such an approach would open a space whereby we actively consider the question of extending political voice to non-citizens. Third and lastly, an agonistic framework recognizes that exclusion is an unavoidable element in the constitution of any political community, yet it provides us with a framework of radical pluralism by which to legitimate and continuously renegotiate the terms of that exclusion. An agonistic approach “refus[es] to equate concern for human dignity with a quest for rational consensus” or overarching agreement on the principles driving our political engagement (Connolly 2002, x). Rather, the goal becomes exposure of those moments which are characterized as consensus as the opposite: instances of “originary exclusion” and moments of “hegemony disguised as the reconciliation of two conflicting logics” (Mouffe 2000).19 However, the problem for agonists is not exclusion in and of itself, contrary to what some critics have charged.20 William Connolly notes that boundaries are “indispensable”, providing the “preconditions of identity, individual agency, and collective action” (1994, 19). Yet boundaries always accomplish this at the expense of other possibilities, other modes of order. Thus, while agonists recognize that universal inclusion within the political community is an illusory goal, they critique the treatment of exclusion as apolitical or natural, devoid of a decisionistic moment in which a “we-they” distinction is politically created. To act as if these normative tensions can be transcended is to misconceive of the democratic project. By such accounts, Honig writes, the problem of democratic theory is how to find the right match between a people and its law, a state and its institutions. Obstacles are met and overcome, eventually the right match is made and the newlywed couple is sent on its way to try and live happily ever after (Honig 2001b, 109). The reality, according to an agonistic framework, is that such tensions are never truly “overcome”, or to appropriate Honig’s metaphor, the newlyweds are never completely in a state of marital bliss with one another.

#### ( ) Dogmatism – the insistence that we always discuss their argument devolves debate into polemics and dogmatism – creates a violent and unproductive model of communication

Foucault ‘84

(Michel, “Polemics, Politics and Problematizations” Interview by Paul Rabinow, http://foucault.info/foucault/interview.html)

I like discussions, and when I am asked questions, I try to answer them. It’s true that I don’t like to get involved in polemics. If I open a book and see that the author is accusing an adversary of “infantile leftism” I shut it again right away. That’s not my way of doing things; I don’t belong to the world of people who do things that way. I insist on this difference as something essential: a whole morality is at stake, the one that concerns the search for truth and the relation to the other.¶ In the serious play of questions and answers, in the work of reciprocal elucidation, the rights of each person are in some sense immanent in the discussion. They depend only on the dialogue situation. The person asking the questions is merely exercising the right that has been given him: to remain unconvinced, to perceive a contradiction, to require more information, to emphasize different postulates, to point out faulty reasoning, and so on. As for the person answering the questions, he too exercises a right that does not go beyond the discussion itself; by the logic of his own discourse, he is tied to what he has said earlier, and by the acceptance of dialogue he is tied to the questioning of other. Questions and answers depend on a game—a game that is at once pleasant and difficult—in which each of the two partners takes pains to use only the rights given him by the other and by the accepted form of dialogue.¶ The polemicist, on the other hand, proceeds encased in privileges that he possesses in advance and will never agree to question. On principle, he possesses rights authorizing him to wage war and making that struggle a just undertaking; the person he confronts is not a partner in search for the truth but an adversary, an enemy who is wrong, who is armful, and whose very existence constitutes a threat. For him, then the game consists not of recognizing this person as a subject having the right to speak but of abolishing him as interlocutor, from any possible dialogue; and his final objective will be not to come as close as possible to a difficult truth but to bring about the triumph of the just cause he has been manifestly upholding from the beginning. The polemicist relies on a legitimacy that his adversary is by definition denied.¶ Perhaps, someday, a long history will have to be written of polemics, polemics as a parasitic figure on discussion and an obstacle to the search for the truth. Very schematically, it seems to me that today we can recognize the presence in polemics of three models: the religious model, the judiciary model, and the political model. As in heresiology, polemics sets itself the task of determining the intangible point of dogma, the fundamental and necessary principle that the adversary has neglected, ignored or transgressed; and it denounces this negligence as a moral failing; at the root of the error, it finds passion, desire, interest, a whole series of weaknesses and inadmissible attachments that establish it as culpable. As in judiciary practice, polemics allows for no possibility of an equal discussion: it examines a case; it isn’t dealing with an interlocutor, it is processing a suspect; it collects the proofs of his guilt, designates the infraction he has committed, and pronounces the verdict and sentences him. In any case, what we have here is not on the order of a shared investigation; the polemicist tells the truth in the form of his judgment and by virtue of the authority he has conferred on himself. But it is the political model that is the most powerful today. Polemics defines alliances, recruits partisans, unites interests or opinions, represents a party; it establishes the other as an enemy, an upholder of opposed interests against which one must fight until the moment this enemy is defeated and either surrenders or disappears.¶ Of course, the reactivation, in polemics, of these political, judiciary, or religious practices is nothing more than theater. One gesticulates: anathemas, excommunications, condemnations, battles, victories, and defeats are no more than ways of speaking, after all. And yet, in the order of discourse, they are also ways of acting which are not without consequence. There are the sterilizing effects. Has anyone ever seen a new idea come out of a polemic? And how could it be otherwise, given that here the interlocutors are incited not to advance, not to take more and more risks in what they say, but to fall back continually on the rights that they claim, on their legitimacy, which they must defend, and on the affirmation of their innocence? There is something even more serious here: in this comedy, one mimics war, battles, annihilations, or unconditional surrenders, putting forward as much of one’s killer instinct as possible. But it is really dangerous to make anyone believe that he can gain access to the truth by such paths and thus to validate, even if in a merely symbolic form, the real political practices that could be warranted by it. Let us imagine, for a moment, that a magic wand is waved and one of the two adversaries in a polemic is given the ability to exercise all the power he likes over the other. One doesn’t even have to imagine it: one has only to look at what happened during the debate in the USSR over linguistics or genetics not long ago. Were these merely aberrant deviations from what was supposed to be the correct discussion? Not at all—they were the real consequences of a polemic attitude whose effects ordinarily remain suspended.

### AT//We Define Your Ground / You Can Impact-Turn

#### ( ) The ground you afford to us isn’t predictable. Focus on ideals devolves into limitless advocacy- emphasis on political effects avoids the black whole of theoretical idealism

Lutz ‘2k

[Donald S. Lutz, Professor of Polisci at Houston, 2000 Political Theory and Partisan Politics p. 39-40]

Aristotle notes in the Politics that political theory simultaneously proceeds at three levels—discourse about the ideal, about the best possible in the real world, and about existing political systems.4 Put another way, comprehensive political theory must ask several differ­ent kinds of questions that are linked, yet distinguishable. In order to understand the interlocking set of questions that political theory can ask, imagine a continuum stretching from left to right. At the end, to the right, is an ideal form of government, a perfectly wrought con­struct produced by the imagination. At the other end is the perfect dystopia, the most perfectly wretched system that the human imagi­nation can produce. Stretching between these two extremes is an infi­nite set of possibilities, merging into one another, that describe the logical possibilities created by the characteristics defining the end points. For example, a political system defined primarily by equality would have a perfectly inegalitarian system described at the other end, and the possible states of being between them would vary prima­rily in the extent to which they embodied equality. An ideal defined primarily by liberty would create a different set of possibilities be­tween the extremes. Of course, visions of the ideal often are inevitably more complex than these single-value examples indicate, but it is also true that in order to imagine an ideal state of affairs a kind of simpli­fication is almost always required since normal states of affairs invari­ably present themselves to human consciousness as complicated, opaque, and to a significant extent indeterminate. t A non-ironic reading of Plato's Republic leads one to conclude that the creation of these visions of the ideal characterizes political philoso­phy. This is not the case. Any person can generate a vision of the ideal. One job of political philosophy is to ask the question "Is this ideal worth pursuing?" Before the question can be pursued, however, the ideal state of affairs must be clarified, especially with respect to con­ceptual precision and the logical relationship between the proposi­tions that describe the ideal. This pre-theoretical analysis raises the vision of the ideal from the mundane to a level where true philosophi­cal analysis, and the careful comparison with existing systems can proceed fruitfully. The process of pre-theoretical analysis, probably because it works on clarifying ideas that most capture the human imagination, too often looks to some like the entire enterprise of political philosophy.5 However, the value of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of the General Will, for example, lies not in its formal logical implications, nor in its compelling hold on the imagination, but on the power and clarity it lends to an analysis and comparison of ac­tual political systems. Among other things it allows him to show that anyone who wishes to pursue a state of affairs closer to that summed up in the concept of the General Will must successfully develop a civil religion. To the extent politicians believe theorists who tell them that pre-theoretical clarification of language describing an ideal is the essence and sum total of political philosophy, to that extent they will properly conclude that political philosophers have little to tell them, since politics is the realm of the possible not the realm of logical clarity. However, once the ideal is clarified, the political philosopher will begin to articulate and assess the reasons why we might want to pursue such an ideal. At this point, analysis leaves the realm of pure logic and enters the realm of the logic of human longing, aspiration, and anxi­ety. The analysis is now limited by the interior parameters of the human heart (more properly the human psyche) to which the theorist must appeal. Unlike the clarification stage where anything that is logical is possible, there are now definite limits on where logic can take us. Appeals to self-destruction, less happiness rather than more, psychic isolation, enslavement, loss of identity, a preference for the lives of mollusks over that of humans, to name just a few possibilities, are doomed to failure. The theorist cannot appeal to such values if she or he is to attract an audience of politicians. Much political theory in­volves the careful, competitive analysis of what a given ideal state of affairs entails, and as Plato shows in his dialogues the discussion between the philosopher and the politician will quickly terminate if he or she cannot convincingly demonstrate the connection between the political ideal being developed and natural human passions. In this way, the politician can be educated by the possibilities that the politi­cal theorist can articulate, just as the political theorist can be educated by the relative success the normative analysis has in "setting the hook" of interest among nonpolitical theorists. This realm of discourse, domi­nated by the logic of humanly worthwhile goals, requires that the theorist carefully observe the responses of others in order not to be seduced by what is merely logical as opposed to what is humanly rational. Moral discourse conditioned by the ideal, if it is to be suc­cessful, requires the political theorist to be fearless in pursuing norma­tive logic, but it also requires the theorist to have enough humility to remember that, if a non-theorist cannot be led toward an ideal, the fault may well lie in the theory, not in the moral vision of the non-theorist.

### AT//You Police Us

#### ( ) Not all dialogues are created equal – having *rules* is necessary to make the dialogue *productive*

Bostad ‘4

[Finn. Assc Prof Linguistics at Norwegian Univ of Science.

[<http://www.flt.uae.ac.ma/elhirech/baktine/140391690X%20-%20-%20Bakhtinian%20Perspectives%20on%20Language%20and%20Culture~%20Meaning%20in%20Language,%20Art%20and%20New%20.pdf>¶ 2004]

Very often a dialogue exists only if the persons involved in the communication act observe and respect some rules of dialogism, and some of these main ‘rules’ or principles may be a mutual trust or reciprocity (Rommetveit 1992), a sharing of power and comprehension that gives everybody an equal opportunity to have his or her voice heard. In addition there must be a conscious effort on the part of the participants to achieve something together and actively participate in the process of negotiating meaning that a dialogue is. Negotiated meaning, or understanding, grows out of the response as ‘[u]nderstanding and response are dialectically merged and mutually condition each other; one is impossible without the other’ (Bakhtin 1981: 282). It is possible to generate a long catalogue of such principles, which Linell does in his work (Linell 1998). There is also a wide range of dialogical varieties from, at the one end, a top-down monologue where one party dominates communication and leaves no room for sharing and participation, to, at the other end, a communicative event where power and dominance is more or less equally shared between the participants. In this near ideal situation there is no real centre of power, but a sharing of it.

### AT//Open-Ended / Unfocused Discussions Good

#### Focused discussions are better than open-ended ones:

#### ( ) We control uniqueness---the purpose of debate should be determined by what unique role this forum can play---\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ can occur in ANY forums like protests, town hall meetings, or the classroom. Debate provides a forum that facilitates in-depth and focused discussions about the topic. This facilitates a unique sort of critical thinking that no other forum can generate

Muir ‘93

[Star. Prof Comm @ George Mason. Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol 26 No 4 1993 JSTOR]

Firm moral commitment to a value system, however, along with a sense of moral identity, is founded in reflexive assessments of multiple perspectives. Switch-side debate is not simply a matter of speaking persuasively or organizing ideas clearly (although it does involve these), but of understanding and mobilizing arguments to make an effective case. Proponents of debating both sides observe that the debaters should prepare the best possible case they can, given the facts and information available to them. This process at its core, involves critical assessment and evaluation of arguments; it is a process of critical thinking not available with many traditional teaching methods. We must progressively learn to recognize how often the concepts of others are discredited by the concepts we use to justify ourselves to ourselves. We must come to see how often our claims are compelling only when expressed in our own egocentric view. We can do this if we learn the art of using concepts without living in them. This is possible only when the intellectual act of stepping outside our own systems of belief has become second nature, a routine and ordinary responsibility of everyday living. Neither academic schooling nor socialization has yet addressed this moral responsibility, but switch-side debating fosters this type of role playing and generates reasoned moral positions based in part on values of tolerance and fairness.

#### ( ) This takes out their offense--- you aren’t convincing the judges of anything substantive---it’s more important to preserve the method of switch-side debate

Muir ‘93

[Star. Prof Comm @ George Mason. Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol 26 No 4 1993 JSTOR]

The emphasis on method---focusing on the technique of debate as an educational end---is characteristic of the defense of debating both sides of a resolution. Interscholastic debate, many scholars reason, is different from “real world” disputation; it lacks the purposes or functions of a senate speech, a public demonstration, or a legal plea. Debate is designed to train students to construct arguments, to locate weaknesses in reasoning, to organize ideas, and to present and defend ideas effectively, not to convert the judge to a particular belief. As such, it is intended to teach debaters to see both sides of an issue and to become proficient in the exposition of argument independent of moral or ethical convictions. The debaters are to present the best case possible given the issues they have to work with. The definition of debate thus shapes a conception of its role in the development of the individual. Windes reaffirms the value of such a procedural training in his view of the activity: Academic debating is a generic term for oral contests in argumentation, held according to established rules, the purpose being to present both sides of a controversy so effectively that a decision may be reached---not on which side was right or wrong but on which side did the better job of arguing. Academic debating is gamesmanship applied to argumentation, not the trivial and amusing gamesmanship often thought of, but sober, realistic, important gamesmanship.

#### ( ) Unfocused discussions stop us from taking productive actions to remedy the harms of the 1AC

Tonn ‘5

(Mari Boor, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland, “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public” Rhetoric & Public Affairs Vol. 8, No. 3.)

In certain ways, Schudson’s initial reluctance to dismiss public conversation echoes my own early reservations, given the ideals of egalitarianism, empowerment, and mutual respect conversational advocates champion. Still, in the spirit of the dialectic ostensibly underlying dialogic premises, this essay argues that various negative consequences can result from transporting conversational and therapeutic paradigms into public problem solving. In what follows, I extend Schudson’s critique of a conversational model for democracy in two ways: First, whereas Schudson primarily offers a theoretical analysis, I interrogate public conversation as a praxis in a variety of venues, illustrating how public “conversation” and “dialogue” have been coopted to silence rather than empower marginalized or dissenting voices. In practice, public conversation easily can emulate what feminist political scientist Jo Freeman termed “the tyranny of structurelessness” in her classic 1970 critique of consciousness- raising groups in the women’s liberation movement,15 as well as the key traits Irving L. Janis ascribes to “groupthink.”16 Thus, contrary to its promotion as a means to neutralize hierarchy and exclusion in the public sphere, public conversation can and has accomplished the reverse. When such moves are rendered transparent, public conversation and dialogue, I contend, risk increasing rather than diminishing political cynicism and alienation. Second, whereas Schudson focuses largely on ways a conversational model for democracy may mute an individual’s voice in crafting a resolution on a given question at a given time, I draw upon insights of Dana L. Cloud and others to consider ways in which a therapeutic, conversational approach to public problems can stymie productive, collective action in two respects.17 First, because conversation has no clearly defined goal, a public conversation may engender inertia as participants become mired in repeated airings of personal experiences without a mechanism to lend such expressions direction and closure. As Freeman aptly notes, although “[u]nstructured groups may be very effective in getting [people] to talk about their lives[,] they aren’t very good for getting things done. Unless their mode of operation changes, groups flounder at the point where people tire of ‘just talking.’”18 Second, because the therapeutic bent of much public conversation locates social ills and remedies within individuals or dynamics of interpersonal relationships, public conversations and dialogues risk becoming *substitutes* for policy formation necessary to correct structural dimensions of social problems. In mimicking the emphasis on the individual in therapy, Cloud warns, the therapeutic rhetoric of “healing, consolation, and adaptation or adjustment” tends to “encourage citizens to perceive political issues, conflicts, and inequities as personal failures subject to personal amelioration.”19

### AT//Debate’s Bad / We Fix Debate

#### ( ) We like debate the way it is:

#### 1. It’s fun---I love debate tournaments---your interpretation of debate that forces everybody to subscribe to your project in the face of competitive ramifications is a violent act that deprives people of an activity they enjoy just because it’s not run the way you like it. There is intrinsic value to this fact.

#### 2. Education---debate provides students the motivation to research and learn about topics that they normally would care little about---the only reason that anyone cares about your project is because the judges have to judge it and the debaters have to research it. Without this forum, we learn very little.

#### 3. It turns your terminal impact---the critical thinking skills granted by debate enables citizens to become more effective social activists and political citizens---this means that preserving a fair forum for debate is crucial for people to make the case for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in their real lives.

#### ( ) Deliberation is the best alternative to activism because it requires continual testing that bolsters advocacy and inclusion—refusal of side switching leads to group polarization and isolation

Talisse ‘5

(Robert, Prof Phil at Vanderbilt. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 31.4, “Deliberativist responses to activist challenges”) \*note: gendered language in this article refers to arguments made by two specific individuals in an article by Iris Young

Nonetheless, the deliberativist conception of reasonableness differs from the activist’s in at least one crucial respect. On the deliberativist view, a necessary condition for reasonableness is the willingness not only to offer justifications for one’s own views and actions, but also to listen to criticisms, objections, and the justificatory reasons that can be given in favor of alternative proposals.¶ In light of this further stipulation, we may say that, on the deliberative democrat’s view, reasonable citizens are responsive to reasons, their views are ‘reason tracking’. Reasonableness, then, entails an acknowledgement on the part of the citizen that her current views are possibly mistaken, incomplete, and in need of revision. Reasonableness is hence a two-way street: the reasonable citizen is able and willing to offer justifications for her views and actions, but is also prepared to consider alternate views, respond to criticism, answer objections, and, if necessary, revise or abandon her views. In short, reasonable citizens do not only believe and act for reasons, they aspire to believe and act according to the best reasons; consequently, they recognize their own fallibility in weighing reasons and hence engage in public deliberation in part for the sake of improving their views.15 ‘Reasonableness’ as the deliberative democrat understands it is constituted by a willingness to participate in an ongoing public discussion that inevitably involves processes of self-examination by which one at various moments rethinks and revises one’s views in light of encounters with new arguments and new considerations offered by one’s fellow deliberators. Hence Gutmann and Thompson write:¶ Citizens who owe one another justifications for the laws that they seek to impose must take seriously the reasons their opponents give. Taking seriously the reasons one’s opponents give means that, at least for a certain range of views that one opposes, one must acknowledge the possibility that an opposing view may be shown to be correct in the future. This acknowledgement has implications not only for the way they regard their own views. It imposes an obligation to continue to test their own views, seeking forums in which the views can be challenged, and keeping open the possibility of their revision or even rejection.16 (2000: 172)¶ That Young’s activist is not reasonable in this sense is clear from the ways in which he characterizes his activism. He claims that ‘Activities of protest, boycott, and disruption are more appropriate means for getting citizens to think seriously about what until then they have found normal and acceptable’ (106); activist tactics are employed for the sake of ‘bringing attention’ to injustice and making ‘a wider public aware of institutional wrongs’ (107). These characterizations suggest the presumption that questions of justice are essentially settled; the activist takes himself to know what justice is and what its implementation requires. He also believes he knows that those who oppose him are either the power-hungry beneficiaries of the unjust status quo or the inattentive and unaware masses who do not ‘think seriously’ about the injustice of the institutions that govern their lives and so unwittingly accept them. Hence his political activity is aimed exclusively at enlisting other citizens in support of the cause to which he is tenaciously committed.¶ The activist implicitly holds that there could be no reasoned objection to his views concerning justice, and no good reason to endorse those institutions he deems unjust. The activist presumes to know that no deliberative encounter could lead him to reconsider his position or adopt a different method of social action; he ‘declines’ to ‘engage persons he disagrees with’ (107) in discourse because he has judged on a priori grounds that all opponents are either pathetically benighted or balefully corrupt. When one holds one’s view as the only responsible or just option, there is no need for reasoning with those who disagree, and hence no need to be reasonable.¶ According to the deliberativist, this is the respect in which the activist is unreasonable. The deliberativist recognizes that questions of justice are difficult and complex. This is the case not only because justice is a notoriously tricky philosophical concept, but also because, even supposing we had a philosophically sound theory of justice, questions of implementation are especially thorny. Accordingly, political philosophers, social scientists, economists, and legal theorists continue to work on these questions. In light of much of this literature, it is difficult to maintain the level of epistemic confidence in one’s own views that the activist seems to muster; thus the deliberativist sees the activist’s confidence as evidence of a lack of honest engagement with the issues. A possible outcome of the kind of encounter the activist ‘declines’ (107) is the realization that the activist’s image of himself as a ‘David to the Goliath of power wielded by the state and corporate actors’ (106) is naïve. That is, the deliberativist comes to see, through processes of public deliberation, that there are often good arguments to be found on all sides of an important social issue; reasonableness hence demands that one must especially engage the reasons of those with whom one most vehemently disagrees and be ready to revise one’s own views if necessary. Insofar as the activist holds a view of justice that he is unwilling to put to the test of public criticism, he is unreasonable. Furthermore, insofar as the activist’s conception commits him to the view that there could be no rational opposition to his views, he is literally unable to be reasonable. Hence the deliberative democrat concludes that activism, as presented by Young’s activist, is an unreasonable model of political engagement. ¶ The dialogical conception of reasonableness adopted by the deliberativist also provides a response to the activist’s reply to the charge that he is engaged in interest group or adversarial politics. Recall that the activist denied this charge on the grounds that activism is aimed not at private or individual interests, but at the universal good of justice. But this reply also misses the force of the posed objection. On the deliberativist view, the problem with interest-based politics does not derive simply from the source (self or group), scope (particular or universal), or quality (admirable or deplorable) of the interest, but with the concept of interests as such. Not unlike ‘preferences’, ‘interests’ typically function in democratic theory as fixed dispositions that are non-cognitive and hence unresponsive to reasons. Insofar as the activist sees his view of justice as ‘given’ and not open to rational scrutiny, he is engaged in the kind of adversarial politics the deliberativist rejects.¶ The argument thus far might appear to turn exclusively upon different conceptions of what reasonableness entails. The deliberativist view I have sketched holds that reasonableness involves some degree of what we may call epistemic modesty. On this view, the reasonable citizen seeks to have her beliefs reflect the best available reasons, and so she enters into public discourse as a way of testing her views against the objections and questions of those who disagree; hence she implicitly holds that her present view is open to reasonable critique and that others who hold opposing views may be able to offer justifications for their views that are at least as strong as her reasons for her own. Thus any mode of politics that presumes that discourse is extraneous to questions of justice and justification is unreasonable. The activist sees no reason to accept this. Reasonableness for the activist consists in the ability to act on reasons that upon due reflection seem adequate to underwrite action; discussion with those who disagree need not be involved. According to the activist, there are certain cases in which he does in fact know the truth about what justice requires and in which there is no room for reasoned objection. Under such conditions, the deliberativist’s demand for discussion can only obstruct justice; it is therefore irrational. ¶ It may seem that we have reached an impasse. However, there is a further line of criticism that the activist must face. To the activist’s view that at least in certain situations he may reasonably decline to engage with persons he disagrees with (107), the deliberative democrat can raise the phenomenon that Cass Sunstein has called ‘group polarization’ (Sunstein, 2003; 2001a: ch. 3; 2001b: ch. 1). To explain: consider that political activists cannot eschew deliberation altogether; they often engage in rallies, demonstrations, teach-ins, workshops, and other activities in which they are called to make public the case for their views. Activists also must engage in deliberation among themselves when deciding strategy. Political movements must be organized, hence those involved must decide upon targets, methods, and tactics; they must also decide upon the content of their pamphlets and the precise messages they most wish to convey to the press. Often the audience in both of these deliberative contexts will be a self-selected and sympathetic group of like-minded activists.¶ Group polarization is a well-documented phenomenon that has ‘been found all over the world and in many diverse tasks’; it means that ‘members of a deliberating group predictably move towards a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ predeliberation tendencies’ (Sunstein, 2003: 81–2). Importantly, in groups that ‘engage in repeated discussions’ over time, the polarization is even more pronounced (2003: 86). Hence discussion in a small but devoted activist enclave that meets regularly to strategize and protest ‘should produce a situation in which individuals hold positions more extreme than those of any individual member before the series of deliberations began’ (ibid.).17 ¶ The fact of group polarization is relevant to our discussion because the activist has proposed that he may reasonably decline to engage in discussion with those with whom he disagrees in cases in which the requirements of justice are so clear that he can be confident that he has the truth. Group polarization suggests that deliberatively confronting those with whom we disagree is essential even when we have the truth. For even if we have the truth, if we do not engage opposing views, but instead deliberate only with those with whom we agree, our view will shift progressively to a more extreme point, and thus we lose the truth. In order to avoid polarization, deliberation must take place within heterogeneous ‘argument pools’ (Sunstein, 2003: 93). This of course does not mean that there should be no groups devoted to the achievement of some common political goal; it rather suggests that engagement with those with whom one disagrees is essential to the proper pursuit of justice. Insofar as the activist denies this, he is unreasonable.

### AT//Debate’s Rigged / We Can’t Win

#### ( ) There's a distinction between institutional and competitive fairness—neither team solves the fact that economic inequality, personal obligations, and geography influence success, but their remedy makes it worse. Unlimited topics are more exploitable by teams with large research capacities, and having a limited topic at least means there's an equal burden for both sides of the topic.

#### ( ) The argument that our framework is systemically biased is a self-serving assertion to sidestep clash—all of their reasons not to defend the topic can be appropriated by actors with opposite goals

Talisse ‘5

(Robert, Prof Phil at Vanderbilt. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 31.4, “Deliberativist responses to activist challenges”) \*note: gendered language in this article refers to arguments made by two specific individuals in an article by Iris Young

My call for a more detailed articulation of the second activist challenge may be met with the radical claim that I have begged the question. It may be said that my analysis of the activist’s challenge and my request for a more rigorous argument presume what the activist denies, namely, that arguments and reasons operate independently of ideology. Here the activist might begin to think that he made a mistake in agreeing to engage in a discussion with a deliberativist – his position throughout the debate being that one should decline to engage in argument with one’s opponents! He may say that of course activism seems lacking to a deliberativist, for the deliberativist measures the strength of a view according to her own standards. But the activist rejects those standards, claiming that they are appropriate only for seminar rooms and faculty meetings, not for real-world politics. Consequently the activist may say that by agreeing to enter into a discussion with the deliberativist, he had unwittingly abandoned a crucial element of his position. He may conclude that the consistent activist avoids arguing altogether, and communicates only with his comrades. Here the discussion ends.¶ However, the deliberativist has a further consideration to raise as his discursive partner departs for the next rally or street demonstration. The foregoing debate had presumed that there is but one kind of activist and but one set of policy objectives that activists may endorse. Yet Young’s activist is opposed not only by deliberative democrats, but also by persons who also call themselves ‘activists’ and who are committed to a set of policy objectives quite different from those endorsed by this one activist. Once these opponents are introduced into the mix, the stance of Young’s activist becomes more evidently problematic, even by his own standards.¶ To explain: although Young’s discussion associates the activist always with politically progressive causes, such as the abolition of the World Trade Organization (109), the expansion of healthcare and welfare programs (113), and certain forms of environmentalism (117), not all activists are progressive in this sense. Activists on the extreme and racist Right claim also to be fighting for justice, fairness, and liberation. They contend that existing processes and institutions are ideologically hegemonic and distorting. Accordingly, they reject the deliberative ideal on the same grounds as Young’s activist. They advocate a program of political action that operates outside of prevailing structures, disrupting their operations and challenging their legitimacy. They claim that such action aims to enlighten, inform, provoke, and excite persons they see as complacent, naïve, excluded, and ignorant. Of course, these activists vehemently oppose the policies endorsed by Young’s activist; they argue that justice requires activism that promotes objectives such as national purity, the disenfranchisement of Jews, racial segregation, and white supremacy. More importantly, they see Young’s activist’s vocabulary of ‘inclusion’, ‘structural inequality’, ‘institutionalized power’, as fully in line with what they claim is a hegemonic ideology that currently dominates and systematically distorts our political discourses.21¶ The point here is not to imply that Young’s activist is no better than the racist activist. The point rather is that Young’s activist’s arguments are, in fact, adopted by activists of different stripes and put in the service of a wide range of policy objectives, each claiming to be just, liberatory, and properly inclusive.22 In light of this, there is a question the activist must confront. How should he deal with those who share his views about the proper means for bringing about a more just society, but promote a set of ends that he opposes?¶ It seems that Young’s activist has no way to deal with opposing activist programs except to fight them or, if fighting is strategically unsound or otherwise problematic, to accept a Hobbesian truce. This might not seem an unacceptable response in the case of racists; however, the question can be raised in the case of any less extreme but nonetheless opposed activist program, including different styles of politically progressive activism. Hence the deliberativist raises her earlier suspicions that, in practice, activism entails a politics based upon interestbased power struggles amongst adversarial factions.

### AT//Competition’s Bad

#### If competition’s bad then you should just vote negative on presumption – they have not presented a reason to vote affirmative and they any “ballot key” argument obviously contradicts with their indicts of a competitive framework. Presumption goes negative – there’s an inherent risk associated with change.

#### ( ) Competition is good – it’s the only way to keep students interested and produce motivated advocates

Garris et al ‘2

(Rosemary Garris Robert Ahlers Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division James E. Driskell Florida Maxima Corporation SIMULATION & GAMING, Vol. 33 No. 4, December 2002 “Games, motivation, and learning: A research and practice model” 441-467 DOI: 10.1177/1046878102238607 <http://sag.sagepub.com/content/33/4/441.abstract> Herm )

There are a number of empirical studies that have examined the effects of gamebased instructional programs on learning. For example, both Whitehall and McDonald (1993) and Ricci et al. (1996) found that instruction incorporating game features led to improved learning. The rationale provided for these positive results varied, given the different factors examined in these studies. Whitehall and McDonald argued that incorporating a variable payoff schedule into a simulation game led to increased risk taking among students, which resulted in greater persistence on the task and improved performance. Ricci et al. proposed that instruction that incorporated game features enhanced student motivation, which led to greater attention to training content and greater retention. Although students generally seem to prefer games over other, more traditional, classroom training media, reviews have reported mixed results regarding the training effectiveness of games. Pierfy (1977) evaluated the results of 22 simulation-based training game effectiveness studies to determine patterns in training effectiveness across games. Twenty-one of the studies collected learning data that generally consisted of paper-and-pencil fact-and-principle knowledge tests. Three of the studies reported results favoring the effectiveness of games over conventional teaching; 3 reported results favoring the effectiveness of conventional teaching over games; and the remaining 15 found no significant differences. Eleven studies also tested retention of learning. Eight of these studies indicated that retention was superior for game-based training; the remaining 3 yielded no significant differences. Level of student preference for training games over classroom instruction was assessed in 8 of the studies, and in 7 of those, students reported greater interest in simulation game activities than in conventional teaching methods. In a more recent review, Druckman (1995) concluded that games seem to be effective in enhancing motivation and increasing student interest in subject matter, yet the extent to which this translates into more effective learning is less clear.

#### ( ) Competitive debate’s good — it encourages education, strong community, and increases quality of work

GILLESPIE AND GORDON ‘6

(William and Elizabeth, Kennesaw State University, “Competition, Role-Playing, and Political Science Education,” Sep 1, http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/5/1/0/0/pages151007/p151007-1.php)

But, for the most part, coaches report that the competitive element enhances learning in several ways. First, many coaches perceive that competition motivates their students to put in the time and do their best work. Some indicate that no other means of motivation is as effective. Engaging in competition allows students to measure their progress. It also provides a goal, raises the stakes of the activity, and provides more rewards. Second, as one coach said, “the activity faithfully recreates many of the dynamics of the adversarial model, and my students report learning a lot.” For the goal of substantive learning about how American law functions, especially in litigation, competition is an essential element. Mock trial allows students to experience some of the processes, constraints, and emotions associated with competition in a courtroom. Third, the stress of competition itself helps students gain flexibility and adaptability. Many coaches mention the ability to “think on one’s feet” as a skill that students acquire in the fluid environment of a mock trial competition. “Competition enhances the learning experience. The students seem to absorb lessons more quickly and thoroughly under fire,” writes one coach. Another writes: “They also learn to adjust and adapt quickly to the different evaluators. That is something they don't get from their regular classes.” Fourth, some coaches explain that competing against other schools allows their students to learn by seeing different approaches to the same case. Representative comments along these lines include: “Students get to see what other teams do and learn from those experiences.” “[Competition] exposes the students to different techniques and approaches that the other teams use.” Fifth, many coaches explain that the competition enhances camaraderie and teamwork among their students. One coach explains that competition “gives a sense of duty to fulfill an obligation to their fellow teammates.” “Students learn teamwork in an interactive and dynamic setting,” reports another.

### AT//Experts Bad

#### ( ) Speaking the language of experts and appealing to their authority is good –your model of debate cedes science and politics to elites who dominate the argumentative frame

Hoppe ‘99

[Robert. Prof Policy at Twente University (Netherlands). “Argumentative Turn” Science and Public Policy, Vol 26 N3, June 99. ]

ACCORDING TO LASSWELL (1971), policy science is about the production and application of knowledge of and in policy. Policy-makers who desire to tackle problems on the political agenda successfully, should be able to mobilise the best available knowledge. This requires high-quality knowledge in policy. Policy-makers and, in a democracy, citizens, also need to know how policy processes really evolve. This demands precise knowledge of policy.¶ There is an obvious link between the two: the more and better the knowledge of policy, the easier it is to mobilise knowledge in policy. Lasswell expresses this interdependence by defining the policy scientist's operational task as eliciting the maximum rational judgement of all those involved in policy-making.¶ For the applied policy scientist or policy analyst this implies the development of two skills. First, for the sake of mobilising the best available knowledge in policy, he/she should be able to mediate between different scientific disciplines. Second, to optimise the interdependence between science in and of policy, she/he should be able to mediate between science and politics. Hence Dunn's (1994, page 84) formal definition of policy analysis as an applied social science discipline that uses multiple research methods in a context of argumentation, public debate [and political struggle] to create, evaluate critically, and communicate policy-relevant knowledge.¶ Historically, the differentiation and successful institutionalisation of policy science can be interpreted as the spread of the functions of knowledge organisation, storage, dissemination and application in the knowledge system (Dunn and Holzner, 1988; van de Graaf and Hoppe, 1989, page 29). Moreover, this scientification of hitherto 'unscientised' functions, by including science of policy explicitly, aimed to gear them to the political system. In that sense, Lerner and Lasswell's (1951) call for policy sciences anticipated, and probably helped bring about, the scientification of politics.¶ Peter Weingart (1999) sees the development of the science-policy nexus as a dialectical process of the scientification of politics/policy and the politicisation of science. Numerous studies of political controversies indeed show that science advisors behave like any other self-interested actor (Nelkin, 1995). Yet science somehow managed to maintain its functional cognitive authority in politics. This may be because of its changing shape, which has been characterised as the emergence of a post-parliamentary and post-national network democracy (Andersen and Burns, 1996, pages 227-251).¶ National political developments are put in the background by ideas about uncontrollable, but apparently inevitable, international developments; in Europe, national state authority and power in public policy-making is leaking away to a new political and administrative elite, situated in the institutional ensemble of the European Union. National representation is in the hands of political parties which no longer control ideological debate. The authority and policy-making power of national governments is also leaking away towards increasingly powerful policy-issue networks, dominated by functional representation by interest groups and practical experts.¶ In this situation, public debate has become even more fragile than it was. It has become diluted by the predominance of purely pragmatic, managerial and administrative argument, and under-articulated as a result of an explosion of new political schemata that crowd out the more conventional ideologies. The new schemata do feed on the ideologies; but in larger part they consist of a random and unarticulated 'mish-mash' of attitudes and images derived from ethnic, local-cultural, professional, religious, social movement and personal political experiences.¶ The market-place of political ideas and arguments is thriving; but on the other hand, politicians and citizens are at a loss to judge its nature and quality.¶ Neither political parties, nor public officials, interest groups, nor social movements and citizen groups, nor even the public media show any inclination, let alone competency, in ordering this inchoate field. In such conditions, scientific debate provides a much needed minimal amount of order and articulation of concepts, arguments and ideas. Although frequently more in rhetoric than substance, reference to scientific 'validation' does provide politicians, public officials and citizens alike with some sort of compass in an ideological universe in disarray.¶ For policy analysis to have any political impact under such conditions, it should be able somehow to continue 'speaking truth' to political elites who are ideologically uprooted, but cling to power; to the elites of administrators, managers, professionals and experts who vie for power in the jungle of organisations populating the functional policy domains of post-parliamentary democracy; and to a broader audience of an ideologically disoriented and politically disenchanted citizenry.

#### ( ) Our framework solves this – policy debate breaks down expert elitism and makes information more accessible

Farley ‘12

[Robert. Asst Prof Diplomacy at University of Kentucky. “Teaching Crisis Decision-Making through Simulations” The World Politics Review, March 2012. [www.worldpoliticsreview.com](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com) ]

Policy simulation’s good---key to portable skills, breaking down expert monopoly on policy advice

What goes for war goes for policy other than war. Public and foreign policy programs have increasingly used simulations as training and teaching tools. Policy initiatives, whether foreign or domestic, generate strategic dynamics; players respond to how other players have changed the game environment. Consequently, playing games can help students develop expertise regarding how to manage strategic dynamics, as well as more specific skills such as crisis negotiation. ¶ At the same time, foreign and public policy schools have become attractive to serious simulators because of the presence of a large number of relatively knowledgeable graduate and advanced undergraduate students with time on their hands. The Army War College -- which runs two negotiation simulations, one involving Nagorno-Karabakh and the other Cyprus -- has taken advantage of this by running its simulations at several major universities, adapting the structure of the game for different groups of players. Last summer, the strategic forecasting firm Wikistrat -- for which I am an analyst -- ran a grand strategy competition involving a large number of major foreign policy programs. ¶ Accordingly, the universe of potential policy simulations and “war games” is virtually limitless. The Paxsims blog, co-edited by WPR contributor Rex Brynen, focuses on the serious use of international political and military simulations, listing dozens of different games played to inform public policy decisions. These simulations include modeling relief efforts following the Haiti earthquake, refining peacekeeping and civilian protection in hostile environments, “replaying” the 2007 Surge in Baghdad, rethinking the partition of India and Pakistan, and -- of course -- sketching out an Israeli bombing campaign against Iranian nuclear facilities. ¶ As in many other fields, the Internet has transformed the development process of policy-oriented simulations. Widely available information and modern information technology makes it possible to bring together subject matter experts with designers, and crowdsourcing helps demonstrate and correct problems and flaws with the simulation. Indeed, the Wikistrat model is built directly on the idea that smart crowdsourcing can produce better policy analysis than reliance on relatively isolated expert opinion. ¶ Patterson School simulations focus on the teaching and training aspects of gaming rather than on verisimilitude. Previous Patterson School simulations have involved a revolution in Belarus, a pirate attack off Somalia, the aftermath of the death of Fidel Castro, an Israeli strike on Iran and a nuclear accident in North Korea. The purpose of these games is to force decision-making under difficult circumstances, hopefully modeling the conditions under which policy professionals produce recommendations and make decisions. ¶ This is not to say that nothing can be learned from the course of the game. In the 2012 simulation, members of the Sinaloa drug cartel launched simultaneous large-scale attacks on the Bellagio in Las Vegas as well as on several targets in Acapulco. All the attacks involved car bombings followed up by teams of heavily armed gunmen employing automatic weapons and hand grenades. The Patterson student cohort was divided into teams representing the Mexican and American national security bureaucracies, regional governments and cartels, with the exercise simulating the government response in the 24 hours immediately following the attack. The simulation ended in an abortive meeting between U.S. President Barack Obama and Mexican President Felipe Calderon. Domestic political pressures played a role on both sides, with Texas Gov. Rick Perry launching a blistering series of attacks against Obama’s handling of the crisis, and the Mexican police consistently undercutting the efforts of the Mexican army. ¶ Our simulation highlighted the problems of bureaucratic competition, indistinct boundaries of responsibility, and mistrust between agencies and governments. The game also gave students an appreciation of the difficulties of dealing with an active and independent media, which remained largely outside their control. Most importantly, it gave students a taste of the difficulty in arriving at coherent, cohesive action even when policy objectives remained broadly in agreement. While students may never face this precise crisis in their subsequent professional careers, they undoubtedly will face situations where policymakers demand options, sleep be damned. ¶ Increasingly realistic simulations involving larger and larger numbers of interested, well-informed players will help structure public policy decision-making for the foreseeable future. Someday, strong performance in such simulations, as well as the ability to craft useful games, may even prove a pathway to success in a public policy career.

### AT//Arguing Against Conviction Bad

#### ( ) They have functionally decided to write their own resolution instead of affirming the one we already have- even if the resolution is wrong, having a devil’s advocate in deliberation is vitally important to critical thinking skills and avoiding groupthink

Mercier and Landemore ‘11

[Hugo and Helene. Philosophy, Politics and Economics prof @ U of Penn, Poli Sci prof @ Yale, Reasoning is for arguing: Understanding the successes and failures of deliberation, Political Psychology, http://sites.google.com/site/hugomercier/publications]

Reasoning can function outside of its normal conditions when it is used purely internally. But it is not enough for reasoning to be done in public to achieve good results. And indeed the problems of individual reasoning highlighted above, such as polarization and overconfidence, can also be found in group reasoning (Janis, 1982; Stasser & Titus, 1985; Sunstein, 2002). Polarization and overconfidence happen because not all group discussion is deliberative. According to some definitions of deliberation, including the one used in this paper, reasoning has to be applied to the same thread of argument *from different opinions* for deliberation to occur. As a consequence, “If the participants are mostly like-minded or hold the same views before they enter into the discussion, they are not situated in the circumstances of deliberation.” (Thompson, 2008: 502). We will presently review evidence showing that the absence or the silencing of dissent is a quasi-necessary condition for polarization or overconfidence to occur in groups. Group polarization has received substantial empirical support. 11 So much support in fact that Sunstein has granted group polarization the status of law (Sunstein, 2002). There is however an important caveat: group polarization will mostly happen when people share an opinion to begin with. In defense of his claim, Sunstein reviews an impressive number of empirical studies showing that many groups tend to form more extreme opinions following discussion. The examples he uses, however, offer as convincing an illustration of group polarization than of the necessity of having group members that share similar beliefs at the outset for polarization to happen (e.g. Sunstein, 2002: 178). Likewise, in his review of the group polarization literature, Baron notes that “The crucial antecedent condition for group polarization to occur is the presence of a likeminded group; i.e. individuals who share a preference for one side of the issue.” (Baron, 2005). Accordingly, when groups do not share an opinion, they tend to depolarize. This has been shown in several experiments in the laboratory (e.g. Kogan & Wallach, 1966; Vinokur & Burnstein, 1978). Likewise, studies of deliberation about political or legal issues report that many groups do not polarize (Kaplan & Miller, 1987; Luskin, Fishkin, & Hahn, 2007; Luskin et al., 2002; Luskin, Iyengar, & Fishkin, 2004; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2000). On the contrary, some groups show a homogenization of their attitude (they depolarize) (Luskin et al., 2007; Luskin et al., 2002). The contrasting effect of discussions with a supportive versus dissenting audience is transparent in the results reported by Hansen ( 2003 reported by Fishkin & Luskin, 2005). Participants had been exposed to new information about a political issue. When they discussed it with their family and friends, they learned more facts supporting their initial position. On the other hand, during the deliberative weekend—and the exposition to other opinions that took place—they learned more of the facts supporting the view they disagreed with. The present theory, far from being contradicted by the observation that groups of likeminded people reasoning together tend to polarize, can in fact account straightforwardly for this observation. When people are engaged in a genuine deliberation, the confirmation bias present in each individual’s reasoning is checked, compensated by the confirmation bias of individuals who defend another opinion. When no other opinion is present (or expressed, or listened to), people will be disinclined to use reasoning to critically examine the arguments put forward by other discussants, since they share their opinion. Instead, they will use reasoning to strengthen these arguments or find other arguments supporting the same opinion. In most cases the reasons each individual has for holding the same opinion will be partially non-overlapping. Each participant will then be exposed to new reasons supporting the common opinion, reasons that she is unlikely to criticize. It is then only to be expected that group members should strengthen their support for the common opinion in light of these new arguments. In fact, groups of like-minded people should have little endogenous motivation to start reasoning together: what is the point of arguing with people we agree with? In most cases, such groups are lead to argue because of some external constraint. These constraints can be more or less artificial—a psychologist telling participants to deliberate or a judge asking a jury for a well supported verdict—but they have to be factored in the explanation of the phenomenon. 4. Conclusion: a situational approach to improving reasoning We have argued that reasoning should not be evaluated primarily, if at all, as a device that helps us generate knowledge and make better decisions through private reflection. Reasoning, in fact, does not do those things very well. Instead, we rely on the hypothesis that the function of reasoning is to find and evaluate arguments in deliberative contexts. This evolutionary hypothesis explains why, when reasoning is used in its normal conditions—in a deliberation—it can be expected to lead to better outcomes, consistently allowing deliberating groups to reach epistemically superior outcomes and improve their epistemic status. Moreover, seeing reasoning as an argumentative device also provides a straightforward account of the otherwise puzzling confirmation bias—the tendency to search for arguments that favor our opinion. The confirmation bias, in turn, generates most of the problems people face when they reason in abnormal conditions— when they are not deliberating. This will happen to people who reason alone while failing to entertain other opinions in a private deliberation and to groups in which one opinion is so dominant as to make all others opinions—if they are even present—unable to voice arguments. In both cases, the confirmation bias will go unchecked and create polarization and overconfidence. We believe that the argumentative theory offers a good explanation of the most salient facts about private and public reasoning. This explanation is meant to supplement, rather than replace, existing psychological theories by providing both an answer to the why-questions and a coherent integrative framework for many previously disparate findings. The present article was mostly aimed at comparing deliberative vs. non-deliberative situations, but the theory could also be used to make finer grained predictions within deliberative situations. It is important to stress that the theory used as the backbone for the article is a theory of reasoning. The theory can only make predictions about reasoning, and not about the various other psychological mechanisms that impact the outcome of group discussion. We did not aim at providing a general theory of group processes that could account for all the results in this domain. But it is our contention that the best way to reach this end is by investigating the relevant psychological mechanisms and their interaction. For these reasons, the present article should only be considered a first step towards more fined grained predictions of when and why deliberation is efficient. Turning now to the consequences of the present theory, we can note first that our emphasis on the efficiency of diverse groups sits well with another recent a priori account of group competence. According to Hong and Page’s Diversity Trumps Ability Theorem for example, under certain plausible conditions, a diverse sample of moderately competent individuals will outperform a group of the most competent individuals (Hong & Page, 2004). Specifically, what explains the superiority of some groups of average people over smaller groups of experts is the fact that cognitive diversity (roughly, the ability to interpret the world differently) can be more crucial to group competence than individual ability (Page, 2007). That argument has been carried over from groups of problem-solvers in business and practical matters to democratically deliberating groups in politics (e.g., Anderson, 2006; Author, 2007, In press). At the practical level, the present theory potentially has important implications. Given that individual reasoning works best when confronted to different opinions, the present theory supports the improvement of the presence or expression of dissenting opinions in deliberative settings. Evidently, many people, in the field of deliberative democracy or elsewhere, are also advocating such changes. While these common sense suggestions have been made in the past (e.g., Bohman,¶ 2007; Sunstein, 2003, 2006), the present theory provides additional arguments for them. It also explains why approaches focusing on individual rather than collective reasoning are not likely to be successful. Specifically tailored practical suggestions can also be made by using departures from the normal conditions of reasoning as diagnostic tools. Thus, different departures will entail different solutions. Accountability—having to defends one’s opinion in front of an audience—can be used to bring individual reasoners closer to a situation of private deliberation. The use of different aggregation mechanisms could help identify the risk of deliberation among like-minded people. For example, before a group launches a discussion, a preliminary vote or poll could establish the extent to which different opinions are represented. If this procedure shows that people agree on the issue at hand, then skipping the discussion may save the group some efforts and reduce the risk of polarization. Alternatively, a devil’s advocate could be introduced in the group to defend an alternative opinion (e.g. Schweiger, Sandberg, & Ragan, 1986).

### AT//Debate Arguments Aren’t True

#### ( ) It’s impossible to know “the truth” – but policy simulation allows us to know which solutions best resolve social ills

Koch ‘91

[Tom. Journalism for the 21st Century, 1991, Pg 117-8. GoogleBooks]

Electronic databases, which make available to the reporter a wide variety of journals, newsletters, and newspaper texts, present the opportunity for a radically different, far more instrumentally satisfactory reportage. Through the “structural” or “contextual” story that this technology makes possible, online resources place the description of an isolated event within the context of a class of similar occurrences so that the journalist is informed by the work and research of other writes—colleagues and academics—involved in and knowledgable about the event or event class in question. The assertions of news subjects are seen as not necessarily “true,” as verified “facts” in and of themselves, but as hypothesis to be examined within a literature’s context. This represents a potentially profound shift in the way data can be treated by public information writers and a significant change in the way data is incorporated into the public sphere. At the very least, this potential informs reporters or editors in a significant way, empowering them, through this electronically-gathered, background information, with a perspective that allows them to question critically an official posture, no matter how politically powerful its official source may be.

### AT//Small Schools

#### ( ) Non-unique and turn – small schools compete now – Beacon was the top seed at the 2011 TOC, Whitney Young won the national championship in 2010, and Iowa City West rolled everybody in 2012. Your model of debate flips this in the short term because it forces small schools to learn a new playbook while large schools will just turn out tons of performative strategies and framework updates

Asen ‘2

[Robert. Prof Comm at Wisconsin. “Imagining in the Public Sphere” Philosophy and Rhetoric, Vol 34, No 4. Summer 2002. JSTOR]

Attention to imagining reveals that including more and more voices in multiple public spheres—a form of direct inclusion—is an indispensable but by itself insufficient reformulation of critical models of the public sphere. As with other discursive norms and practices, imagining may inform interactions even in ostensibly accessible forums. The consequences of collective imagining appear in the doubly disabling tendencies of representation that absent some people from public discourse and yet present them through disabling images. Counterpublic agents encounter these negative images as they enter previously foreclosed forums. Yet disabling tendencies of representation should not prompt a scholarly flight from imagining and its representational power. A flight of this sort would retum public sphere scholarship to a reconstructed bourgeois public sphere as a singular public forum in which everyone—at least in principle—is free to participate. Existing scholarship has demonstrated that such a sphere would most likely betray its legitimating discourses at the level of direct exclusions. A flight from representation also would require a renunciation of political legitimacy, identity formation, cultural diversity, and needs interpretation as appropriate topics of public discourse, for these are social goods. More hopefully, representation ought not to be disavowed because imagining need not be disabling. Counterpublics may interact with wider publics to construct affirmative images of themselves and others that may engender discourses capable of advancing the multiple aims of discourse in the public sphere. Scholars may contribute to this process by elucidating how various forums may exclude potential participants in voice, body, and imagination.

### AT//Speed Bad

#### ( ) Speaking quickly is crucial to effective communication---slow speakers are perceived as boring, lack credibility, and are unpersuasive

Boyd ‘3

[Dr Steven – Prof Speech @ Northern Kentucky. [www.sboyd.com](http://www.sboyd.com), June 2003 ]

Slow speaking with lots of pauses, however, can create lethargy among your audience members, making them passive and indifferent to your message. People can think about four times faster than a person can talk, so the listener has the capacity to assimilate information without loss of comprehension when the speaker speeds up the rate. In contrast, if the presenter speaks slowly he or she can lose the audience’s concentration. Listeners will use the extra thinking time to let their thoughts wander elsewhere--and they may not return! Psychologists have found that speakers who deliver at a rate of 190 words per minute are more likely to seen as credible, objective, knowledgeable, and persuasive as compared to slow speakers. We can see this specifically when attending an auction. If the auctioneer’s chant is too slow, the audience member may lose interest in the item being sold and thus lose the urge to bid. Part of the persuasive aspect of the auction is the auctioneer's rapid chant that accelerates the bidding process and motivates the audience member to bid quickly. Especially in persuasive speaking the same is true. If you are in a spot in your speech where you are moving the audience to action or are seeking to get strong emotional assent of your content, speed up your rate of speech for positive results. One of the appeals of John Kennedy’s pubic speaking was his fast rate of speech. Certainly his Inauguration Speech was powerful in content but Kennedy also delivered it with a rapid rate of speech. Radio and television commercials usually have people speak at an accelerated pace as they extol the value of a particular product. When we speak to each other about something that is important to us, we show our excitement and concern by speaking rapidly. Just because you are delivering a message to a large group does not mean you should slow down to make sure everyone understands. Audiences can handle the fast talker from the lectern. Incorporate a rapid rate of speech to make your speaking more effective.

#### ( ) Speaking quickly also has cognitive benefits that make you smarter

Korcok ‘97

[Michael. Grad Student @ Florida State. “Speak Fast” [www.hsdebate.com](http://www.hsdebate.com), 1997. ]

The best evidence available indicates that speedy speaking makes you smarter. This claim has a now solid base of research support from nearly a quarter-century of studies in cognitive psychology. To a cognitive psychologist this claim would not be surprising nor would it necessarily even be considered controversial: a considerable body of evidence is now available to substantiate the claim that speaking faster makes one smarter. Debate pedagogy is sometimes criticized because debate competitors speak "like auctioneers", are "incomprehensibly fast", or talk "at a ridiculous pace". Occasionally, those objecting press the point by insisting that either individual debaters or that debate as a whole "slow down or else". The proper response to the critics is that speedy speaking is a pedagogically sound practice: speaking faster improves cognitive ability. Speech rate determines working memory capacity and working memory capacity is a critical component of cognitive ability. The argument is that simple, but the support for it is formidable. Two relationships must be shown to establish this argument: 1) speech rate determines working memory capacity. 2) working memory capacity is a critical component of cognitive ability. Initially, both of these relationships have strong support from research in cognitive psychology. An overall sense of this argument was presented in the October 1992 Psychology Today report of the results of the Raine et al study: "If friends criticize you for talking too fast, at least they can't also accuse you of having a bad memory. Speech rate is a strong index of short term memory span... 'Therefore, the faster you can talk, the greater your short-term memory,' says Adrian Raine, PhD, a University of Southern California psychologist. The link has been established for adults for some time, Raine reports in Child Development. Now, he and his colleagues find the correlation holds for kids as well, a finding that promises short-term payoff in the classroom and long-term payoff in life. Short-term memory is the power behind recall of phone numbers, directions, and other everyday tasks. It is also the foundation of arithmetic and reading skills... That raises the possibility that speech- training may be a short-cut to achievement." (p.14)